HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XL OCTOBER, 1947 NUMBER 4

STRATA OF GREEK RELIGION IN AESCHYLUS

FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

PROFESSOR H. J. ROSE'S thoughtful and suggestive article, "Mythology and Theology in Aeschylus," [1] has probably led many students of Aeschylus to reread his tragedies with an eye on the specific problems to which Rose directs our attention and also to rethink such impressions and views concerning Aeschylus' religious outlook as they may previously have formed. Professor Rose skillfully illustrates the difference between mythology and theology by contrasting the praise of Zeus in the first great chorus of Agamemnon with the references to Cassandra's experience which we find in a later part of the same play.[2] It is probably true that there are in Aeschylus' work masses of traditional mythology that have not been reforged by his own creative imagination, not become organically assimilated to his own religion, but these are few and far between. On the whole, mythology provides the material which his vigorous and intense thought hammers into shape — into a new *mythos* which shows the gods acting as Aeschylus' own religious — or theological — convictions demand that they should act. In the larger part of his paper Professor Rose unless I have missed some points, is less anxious to separate the areas of mythology and theology by a clearly drawn boundary line, and to me at least this restraint seems very wise; for if one thinks too rigidly in the terms of these two concepts one runs a risk of cutting through the live tissue and of tearing asunder what has become intimately blended in the poet's own religion. Not that this religion is all "of one piece" or completely homogeneous in all its various aspects. Still less can it be exhausted and adequately represented by a formula or dogma. Quite to the contrary, there are different layers, as it were, in Aeschylus' religion, and an analysis of his thought can separate them and in-

[1] H. T. R. 39, 1946, 1 ff. [2] Ag. 160 ff., 1202 ff.

vestigate each of them by itself — as well as in relation to the others. It is also possible to point out the connection between these various strata or aspects of his religion and the traditional — even institutional — forms of Greek religion which had grown and crystallized in the course of history. To do this — in however sketchy and 'provisional' form — is the purpose of this paper to which Rose's article has given the impulse. The differentiation which we try to bring out does not coincide with Rose's basic categories of mythology and theology: whether it is germane to Aeschylus himself is a question which I must leave to my readers to decide.

What we may call the first stratum is characterized by the *theos genethlios*, the divine ancestor of the family. The members of a family feel a strong attachment to the originator of their *gens*. The cult of its god or hero forms the unifying bond of a family, a phratry, or a phyle,[3] and while this god or hero may not always have been thought of as the common ancestor, a belief of the kind must have been general at least among the aristocratic families. Plato asserts in the Laws that whoever respects the family and holds in awe those "who share the family gods" (*κοινωνία ὁμογνίων θεῶν*) may count on a friendly disposition of these family gods when he begets his own progeny.[4] It is symbolic that this religious conception looms very large in the first play of Aeschylus that has come down to us, the Suppliants. Again and again the Danaid maidens remind themselves and remind Zeus of his union with Io, of his fatherhood of Epaphus; in the remarkable conception of Epaphus they see a pledge of Zeus that he will not abandon his offspring.[5] The sole hopes that are left to them are that Argos will recognize their old connection with its soil and Zeus his old connection with their race. In the tempest of their distress and anguish these hopes are their strong sheet-anchors. (A third motif that is interwoven with these two

[3] Cf. Wilamowitz, Staat u. Gesellsch. d. Griech. (2nd ed., Leipsic-Berlin, 1923) 50 ff.; F. E. Adcock, C. A. H. 3.688; M. P. Nilsson, Gesch. d. griech. Relig. 1 (Munich, 1941) 671 ff.; Eduard Meyer, Gesch. d. Altert. 3 (2nd ed., Stuttgart, 1937) 282 ff.; W. S. Ferguson, Hesperia 7, 1938, 31; also Ferguson's earlier paper C. P. 5, 1910, 257 ff.

[4] Pl. Legg. 5, 729c; in the latter part of the sentence Plato actually uses the words "*genethlioi theoi*."

[5] Cf. Suppl. 17 ff., 42 ff., 167 ff., (291 ff.), 531 ff., 538 f., 574 ff., 592 ff., 1065 ff.

has its roots in the same archaic world of thought: this is the fugitive's and suppliant's right to protection.) [6]

In the choruses of the maidens there are remarkably profound passages which speak of Zeus as the highest, undisputed ruler, as the god who accomplishes his will without effort, who hates Hybris, whose counsels are hidden, whose decisions, like a skillful wrestler, "do not fall upon their back." [7] Such ideas point forward to plays like Agamemnon where they receive, so to speak, an even richer and fuller orchestration and where we can observe that they have emancipated themselves from the older motifs of blood relationship in whose context we find them embedded in the Suppliants.[8] For it is pertinent to note that if the chorus of the Suppliants reach such heights of thought in the course of their songs, their starting point lies in much more earthbound reflections, and that if they begin with such solemn proclamations of their confidence they will after a while come down to earth.[9] Zeus may protect *Dike* and loathe Hybris but in this case the demand of *Dike* is first of all that Zeus take care of his descendants.[10] A more subtle and somewhat more 'ethical' problem of justice, the right of the maidens to refuse marriage with their cousins does indeed enter into the play; in fact it complicates the issue in a fashion that has given many an interpreter of the play a headache — not least because the maidens themselves treat this aspect of *Dike* in a rather offhand manner.[11] They may have to suffer for this attitude: it is quite possible that the funda-

[6] Cf. Suppl. 188 ff., 329 ff., 344 ff.; see below, p. 223.

[7] See esp. Suppl. 85–102, 524 ff., 595 ff.

[8] See e.g. Ag. 160 ff. (cf. Eduard Fraenkel as cited n. 19) 369 ff., 750 ff.

[9] The chorus of which vv. 85 ff. form a part begins with a reference to the ancestry of the Danaid maidens; the stasimon which begins with the powerful invocation "Lord of lords, most blessed of the blessed" and ends with the praise of Zeus' omnipotence and 'planning mind' is in the main a lyric version of what Zeus did to and for Io. The motifs of Zeus' hatred of *hybris*, of his care for his descendants, of his protection of suppliants are hard to disentangle from one another. — It is not easy to say to whom the plural *theoi genetai* (v. 76) refers; T. G. Tucker, The 'Supplices' of Aeschylus (London, 1889) ad. loc. thinks of the "gods presiding over generation," but this can hardly be correct.

[10] Cf. e.g. vv. 167 ff., 590, 1064.

[11] See esp. vv. 387–396; the legal aspect was probably also discussed in the lines that are missing before v. 334; see also v. 340. Yet the action of the maidens is not only at variance with the written laws concerning *epikleroi* but also with the unwritten laws of Aphrodite; see vv. 1034 ff. and below, p. 230. Cf. H. D. F. Kitto, Greek Tragedy (London, 1939) 20 ff.

mental question which in the Suppliants the maidens seek to brush aside loomed larger in the following plays and that it was there that its dialectic and its implications affected the plot in a decisive fashion. We do not know much about the developments in these plays [12] nor need they trouble us now. Our point is that in Aeschylus' first play the relations between man and god are to a very large extent conceived in genealogical terms. To be sure, the subject favored this approach — yet might it not just as well be said that the approach favored the subject? It is hardly correct to maintain (as Professor Rose does on page 9) that "We have side by side the mythological Zeus who is likely to favor his own descendants as any man might and the God of righteousness who espouses the cause of the righteous and uses His omnipotence to forward it." The *theos genethlios* is by no means a "mythical" conception: he is a religious reality in fifth century Athens and is a religious reality in Aeschylus' play. And to the Suppliants at least the distinction which Professor Rose tries to make is not germane: for it is regarded as part of Zeus' righteousness that he should show concern for his descendants and not go back on his old pledge.[13]

In later years this point of view may have lost its fascination for Aeschylus; yet in the Suppliants it unquestionably plays a vital part. The Danaid maidens are fortunate in that (to quote Pindar whose interest in such relationships is well known) "Fate has allotted them to Zeus *genethlios*," [14] not to some obscure god or hero. There is some logic in the fact that Aeschylus' earliest play gives prominence to a religious attitude which while perhaps less spiritual or ethical than the ideas set forth in the choruses of Agamemnon reflects the more closely an essential aspect of his city's social and religious structure. However much Cleisthenes had done to weaken the political importance of families (*gene*), *phratriai* and *phylai* the Suppliants suggests that twenty years after his reforms the religious attachment of a clan to its original "begetter" (*phyturgos*) had retained a good deal of its primitive force and vitality.

[12] For recent attempts at reconstruction see D. S. Robertson, C. R. 38, 1924, 51 ff.; G. Méautis, Eschyle et la trilogie (Paris, 1936) 66 ff.; K. von Fritz, Philologus 91, 1936, 121 ff., 249 ff.

[13] See above, p. 212 and notes 5 and 9.

[14] Pind. Ol. 8.15 f.

In the Seven Against Thebes there are again *theoi genethlioi*, but their function is somewhat different. This time they are the ancestors not of one particular family or *gens* but of the city as such and of its people. More specifically, they are the gods whom the mythical tradition connected with the origin of Thebes. Aeschylus, however, shows no particular interest in this mythical tradition as such, although it was evidently his knowledge of Theban myths which supplied him with the names of the gods to whom he makes the women of the city turn in their anguish — if the scene were laid in Athens and Athens presented under attack, the prayers of the chorus would be addressed primarily to Pallas. With an intensity and frantic despair which recall the state of mind of the suppliant maidens the chorus of the Seven Against Thebes turn to these gods imploring them not to abandon Thebes in the hour of its peril, nor to leave behind its temples and shrines: "What better soil than this will you take in exchange if you abandon to its foe this deep-soiled land, and Dirke's water." [15] Again it is not the "spiritual" aspect of Aeschylus' religion which dominates these choruses; in fact one may note that the chorus at this stage of the play are so overpowered by emotion that they could not convey to us the central spiritual issue, i.e. the opposition between *Dike* and *Hybris* which Aeschylus brings out through the contrast between the messenger's report about the impious conduct of the hostile leaders and the emphasis laid by Eteocles upon the moral qualities of the heroes chosen for defense of the gates.[16] Whether the citizens' relation to the city-holding gods involves reverence for the "altar of *Dike*," avoidance of *Hybris* and resistance to the lure of 'gain,' is a question which we need not take up here. Aeschylus has certainly made no attempt to embody such ethical features in the outcries and frantic prayers of the chorus, who remind the gods of the rich sacrifices which they have received in Thebes and point out that their own interest is bound up with the survival of Thebes.[17] Here again

[15] Sept. 304 ff. On the whole cf. 93–180; 181–286; 301–320; see especially vv. 167 ff., 175 ff., 217–222, 233.

[16] Cf. vv. 375 ff., 421 ff., etc.; 397 ff. (see 409 ff.), 447 ff. Amphiaraus of course is blameless, his *ethos* contrasts with that of his companions (see vv. 568, 597).

[17] Vv. 177 ff., 179 f. Cf. Eteocles at v. 76 f., 271 ff. (the meaning of vv. 271–278 is clear even though the text of at least two lines at the end cannot be reconstructed; see O. Regenbogen, Hermes 68, 1933, 58 ff. and below, n. 22).

Aeschylus has molded into poetic form a variety of religion which existed in his environment. The *theoi poliouchoi* are for the entire city what the *theoi genethlioi* are for the individual *phratria*, *phyle* or *genos*. To see the relation between these two conceptions in the right historical perspective we should remember that the city took over cults of the *gentes* and made them her own concern, sometimes leaving the priesthood to the family in which the cult had originally been maintained.[18] Tragedy itself is an act of service to the gods of the city, not to Dionysus only. A passage of Themistius [19] which has given rise to much discussion amongst students of Greek drama informs us that according to Aristotle "at the earliest stage the chorus when entering celebrated the gods in song."

The *theoi poliouchoi* and *theoi enchorioi* are not absent from the Suppliants either. Being fugitives, that is, having left behind their Egyptian gods, and placing all their reliance on their *genos* the maidens are apt to stress their genealogical ties with Zeus and Io rather than their relation to *theoi poliouchoi* of Argos, a relation which at the beginning of the play is not yet recognized. Nevertheless, already in the Parodos [20] they call upon the gods of the country "whose is the city, whose is the land and the shining water" as well as upon the "gods on high," and the *chthonioi* (the dead or heroes whose graves are objects of worship); all these categories of gods may help them to find protection in Argos. Moreover as soon as the maidens are assured of a home and of hospitality in Argos they pay their respects to and enter into relation with the gods of Argos in a song which makes clear that they have transferred (or are even now transferring) their allegiance from the "mouth of the Nile" to the *theoi poliouchoi* of Argos and to "those (deities) that dwell about Erasinus' ancient stream." [21] It may, however, be noted that the gods of whom

[18] Nilsson, op. cit. (see Note 3) 671 f.

[19] Or. 26, 316 f. The passage is on various counts under suspicion; for discussion of it see A. Lesky, Wien. Stud. 47, 1927, 8 ff. Cf. also Eduard Fraenkel, Philologus 86, 1930, 1 ff., a paper which I have found most helpful since it studies the same choruses and passages even though with a somewhat different purpose. Cf. also Eduard Norden, Aus Altrömischen Priesterbüchern (Skrifter Humanistika Vetenskapssamfundet Lund, 1939), 148, 247, and pass.

[20] Vv. 24 ff.

[21] Vv. 1024 ff. Contrast the attitude of the Egyptian herald who knows neither reverence for nor fear of the Argive gods ("they reared me not" v. 894, also vv.

Aeschylus thinks in such passages of the Suppliants and in connection with Argos are somewhat more strictly local and have less of a mythological background than those of the Theban play.[22]

Even before the maidens are formally admitted to Argos they turn to the altars which they find at the place of their arrival [23] — in this play as well as in the Seven Against Thebes the altars on the stage are anything but purely decorative stage implements; in fact it would be utterly impossible to conceive of the plot without them.[24] The maidens approach the gods of the new country as "suppliants": yet at this early stage the Greek gods are still somewhat unfamiliar to them and their father has to encourage them and to introduce them to the strange appearance and the symbols of the Greek gods.[25] Here Aeschylus does not

---

893, 922). At v. 520 Pelasgus urges the maidens to pray to the *theoi enchorioi* while he is absent. Curiously, instead of complying they burst forth into the hymn on Zeus, the "lord of lords" (vv. 524 ff.).

[22] For a more accurate stratification of Greek religion as reflected in Aeschylus it would be necessary to distinguish between the *theoi poliouchoi* in the specific sense of the word and other ἐγχώριοι οἳ γῆν ἔχουσι including the rivers (cf. Suppl. 24 ff., 705). The *poliouchoi* of *astyanactes* are not necessarily local gods or deities belonging exclusively to the territory in question; they are not the rivers and wells but "inhabit" them and may possibly decide to leave them (cf. Suppl. 1018 ff.; Sept. 304 ff.). The chorus of the Septem do not implore Dirke and Ismenus to defend the city yet Eteocles promises (vv. 271 ff.) that in the event of victory they as well as the *polissouchoi* will receive proper thanks (Regenbogen, Hermes 68, 1933, 59, n. 1 comments well on the phrase πολισσοῦχοι χώρας but errs, I think, in regarding vv. 272–273 as subdividing this concept; Wilamowitz, Aesch. Interpretationen, Berlin, 1914, 106, n. 1, rightly finds additional groups in these lines. Walther Kranz, Stasimon, Berlin, 1933, 41 makes no attempt at differentiation).

[23] Suppl. 207 ff., 222 ff.

[24] In Agamemnon the function of the altars on the stage is almost but still not entirely decorative. In the Septem the altars are less essential for the plot than in the Suppliants, in Agamemnon they are less essential than in the Septem. Incidentally, compare with Sept. 93 f. τίς ἄρα ῥύσεται, τίς ἀρ' ἐπαρκέσει θεῶν ἢ θεᾶν; Horace c. 1.2.25 *quem vocet divum populus ruentis imperi rebus?* after which question Horace turns to the invocation of various *theoi poliouchoi — di quibus septem placuere colles* he calls them in the *carmen saeculare* — and *genethlioi* (of the Julian family yet also as in the case of Mars, the *auctor* = *phytourgos* v. 36, of the Roman nation as a whole). Although the details in this part of the poem reflect contemporary Roman sophistication a Greek pattern clearly underlies. It is the pattern of cultic songs to which Aeschylus too is indebted. In Norden's view (op. cit., see Note 19, 128, 134 ff., 147 f.; cf. also 169 f.) this poem of Horace includes echoes of the *carmen Arvale* or similar old Roman *carmina* which in turn show the influence of Greek songs. These would be songs of the same type as those which according to our argument inspired Horace also directly when he composed c. i, 2 (cf. Norden 251; also 249 "*Horaz schaut Griechisches und Römisches ineinander*").

[25] See esp. v. 220.

characterize the gods at whose altars the maidens pray as *poliouchoi*. Their help is implored on grounds of a different kind. Apollo, too, has once known exile and flight; Poseidon has carried the Danaids without untoward accident across the sea and may now help them to find a good reception on land; Hermes, the herald, may have a good message for them.[26] Thus it is not in view of any family relation or political relation that the gods may be expected to be friendly: they are invoked for reasons connected with their customary function or their own mythical history.

If we now return to the choruses of the Seven Against Thebes we observe that in them too when a reason why a particular god may help is specified it does not always consist in his historical (i.e. mythical) connection with the origin of the city, nor always in his character as *poliouchos*. Pallas is powerful in battle and a protector of cities in general, not of Thebes in particular. Poseidon has a powerful weapon and is the right god to (arouse or) allay "panic." Apollo should live up to his name as *Lyceios*, which probably means that he should be a wolf to the enemy's army, an *averruncus* as Wilamowitz puts it. Artemis' bow will be helpful.[27] Zeus can accomplish everything and has power over everything.[28] Clearly, these gods are invoked because their customary sphere of activity suggests that they are able to assist Thebes in the present emergency. They are not reminded of any genealogical or political ties between themselves and the city; rather what the chorus see fit to mention when they ask these gods for help is their traditional, roughly speaking their Homeric, function — Homeric in the sense in which Herodotus affirms that it was Homer and Hesiod who assigned to the gods their respective honors and arts[29] (However much of his statement we may wish to discount it is convenient and in some measure justified to refer to this aspect of the Aeschylean gods as their Homeric character). Yet in the same chorus Ares is urged to come to the aid of Thebes because it is his city; Cypris because she is the ancestress of the Theban "race" (*genos*) — "From your blood are we sprung"; Onka because the interest of this Boeotian deity in the preserva-

[26] Vv. 214 ff. (vv. 212 f. have so far defied explanation).
[27] Sept. 127 ff., 145 ff. (cf. Wilamowitz's note in his edition to v. 161), vv. 149 ff.
[28] He is *panteles* (v. 116) and *pankrates* (v. 255; cf. v. 161).
[29] 2.53.

tion of Thebes can be taken for granted — the verses in which she is mentioned seem to refer, though perhaps less explicitly than in the case of other deities, to her connection with Thebes.[30] The appeal to Hera includes no indication of the reason why she is called upon.[31] It would of course be unreasonable to suggest that when the chorus ask for Ares' help they are unaware of his specific divine province. To the contrary, we should realize that the god who is reminded that Thebes is his city and that he made it his "well-beloved city" [32] is a good god to assist it in the crisis of war,[33] yet it is undoubtedly characteristic of what I should call the stratification of Greek religion in Aeschylus that some gods are here invoked on local patriotic grounds, others *charta eadem* on "Homeric" grounds.

There are of course numerous other passages in Aeschylus in which a god is the divine exponent of a specific sphere of life and where his name is meant to make us visualize the particular sphere in which he holds sway. Thus, in the songs of blessings for Argos, Ares is asked to spare the city the loss of its youth in war, and Artemis (Artemis Hekate) to be helpful to women in childbirth.[34] This function of the Aeschylean gods is probably the most obvious, perhaps also the most familiar; at any rate it can be taken for granted and needs no further discussion.

It may however be worth considering whether Aeschylus does not at times, when he thinks of some phase of life as given over to the care of a particular god or goddess, invest this sphere with a new significance and solemnity (*semnotes*). Take as an example

[30] Sept. 105 ff., 135 ff., 140 ff., 163 ff. [31] Sept. 152.

[32] Sept. 105 ff. — I have suggested above, p. 215, that Aeschylus inferred this connection between Ares and Thebes from the myths relating to the early history of this city. It is of course also possible that he knew about a cult of Ares in Thebes although it must be said that no evidence for such a cult has thus far been found. L. R. Farnell, The Cults of the Greek States V, 401 speaks with great confidence of Ares' position in Theban cult yet the only passage that he adduces in support of his view is the same that has given rise to our problem (Aesch. Sept. 105 ff.). Cf. also L. Ziehen, R. E. s.v. "Thebai" (1501 f.) where the cults are carefully discussed.

[33] Cf. the dual role of Zeus in the Suppliants (above p. 212) where he is the protector of his offspring but also protector of Justice.

[34] Suppl. 632, 663, 676. Cf. the reference to Apollo in his diverse functions at Ag. 509–513; to Hermes, ibid. 514 f. At Sept. 105 ff., 135 ff., the chorus ask Ares to come to the help of his city, at v. 343 f. the manifestations of the war god are dreaded (see also v. 244).

Aphrodite, a goddess to whom, as Aristophanes sarcastically suggests, Aeschylus may seem to be a stranger.[35] Every Greek knew over which sphere she presided, what "honor she enjoys" and what "province has fallen to her lot among men and immortal gods," to use the words of Hesiod,[36] another poet to whom on the surface of things Aristophanes' mockery might apply. Hesiod does Aphrodite justice, but neither he nor Homer says of her what Aeschylus makes the chorus of handmaidens in the Suppliants point out: "For her august rites the goddess of varied wiles is held in honor." [37] The fact is not new but the tone is. To a later play of the same trilogy belongs the fragment in which Aphrodite herself explains the cosmic significance of her activities in the famous lines "Pure Heaven yearns to deal love's wound to Earth." [38] The force of *eros* that brings man and woman together, the great primeval power which the Danaid maidens have rashly repudiated and failed to "honor," manifests itself in the universe at large: fertility, growth, sprouting, man's livelihood are, one and all, the results of Aphrodite's activity. Now if this passage — perhaps merely by accident, for we do not know what Aphrodite said before these lines — emphasizes the power of Aphrodite outside the realm of human life, that is outside the realm with which we should associate her name primarily, a passage in the Eumenides emphasizes her high "honor" in the sphere of human life and civilized society. When Apollo upbraids the Erinyes in his temple his principal taunt refers to their indifference to the marriage tie.[39] By confining their avenging activity to murders committed against a person of the same blood the Erinyes set at naught the 'pledges' of Zeus and Hera and fail to pay due honor to Cypris: "Cypris is cast aside dishonoured" — was this not also the "sin" of the suppliant maidens? The Erinyes fail to show proper respect to the "marriage bed for which Fate has destined man and woman." What, according to Apollo, is the status of

[35] Aristoph. Ran. 1045.

[36] Theog. 203 ff. (Theog. 188–206 has been athetized by Felix Jacoby; for his arguments see Hermes 61, 1926, 157 ff. The question is too involved for a brief Note, so that I must here content myself with referring to Paul Friedländer, Gött. Gel. Anz. 1931, 256 ff. where the justice of Jacoby's procedure is questioned).

[37] Suppl. 1037 ff.

[38] Frg. 44 Nauck; see Rose pp. 9 f.

[39] Eum. 213–218.

the marriage bed? "It is stronger than an oath and guarded by *Dike*." Regarding the oath we may remember that Hesiod describes it as "the greatest woe among men whenever anyone wittingly swears a false oath." [40] Aeschylus may have felt as strongly about the sanctity of oath as Hesiod, and yet, according to him, to ignore the rights of the marriage bed would be an even greater crime than to violate an oath. The second part of his statement has perhaps even more weight. It is not enough to remember that Athenian law takes a certain interest in marriage;[41] the phrasing allows us to think of this fact but at the same time points to something deeper and more fundamental, since *Dike* does not as a rule represent positive law in Aeschylus. She denotes the spirit in which Zeus rules the world. *Dike* who "always comes in the end" is the basic idea and the basic issue in Aeschylus' plays. However puzzling and perplexing the events which the poet presents to us, however difficult it may be to "scan the mind of Zeus" in their course, it is confidence in his fundamental Justice and in her ultimate triumph which enables the poet to find a meaningful pattern in the welter of human experiences. It is *Dike* and only *Dike* who lights up for Aeschylus the dark and tangled pathways of Zeus' thought. The passage we have quoted from the Eumenides teaches us that some of her rays fall also upon the sphere of Aphrodite. — The opposition between Aphrodite and Artemis which is brought out in the Suppliants [42] and which may have bulked even larger in the other plays of the Danaid trilogy has nothing to do with personal enmity of the Homeric type; as in Euripides' Hippolytus it is the fundamental antagonism between their functions and spheres, between two irreconcilable patterns of life.

We have dealt at perhaps disproportionate length with this

[40] Theog. 321 f. George Thomson's conjectures at Eum. 217 f. seem to me gratuitous. Cypris' name alone would not suffice to indicate marriage yet does so in conjunction with Zeus and *Hera teleia* (this is probably the point also of Suppl. 1036, if I am right in reading this passage in the light of Eum. 213 ff.).

[41] Cf. the recent paper by H. J. Wolff, "Marriage Laws and Family Organization in Ancient Athens" Traditio 2, 1944, 43 ff.

[42] See Suppl. 1031, 1035 ff., and also the significant invocation of Artemis at vv. 141 ff. (esp. 149 f.). A similar antagonism between Apollo and Dionysus seems to have been presented in Aeschylus' Lycurgia; cf. on this trilogy Karl Deichgräber, Gött. gel. Nachr. 1939, 234 ff.

phase of Aeschylus' religion and in discussing the profounder view which Aeschylus takes of Aphrodite and her realm we have found it necessary to touch upon *Dike*. Properly and fundamentally, *Dike* belongs to the sphere of Zeus. The problems of the moral world order crystallize in Aeschylus' tragedies around Zeus, and for all intents and purposes around Zeus alone although Zeus can act through Apollo (as in the Libation-Bearers) or through Athena (as in the Eumenides). As he alone can be trusted to lead events to their right and just conclusion it is essential that he should have the sole and fundamental responsibility, that his power should have no qualifications. Zeus is τελέων τελειότατον κράτος; [43] powers like the Erinyes who have a *telos*, or *kratos* of their own that may bring them into opposition to Zeus and other Olympians are in the end incorporated in his dispensation, his *harmonia*.

Although the poet may (as we have seen) give a deeper meaning to the sphere and province of other gods, it is in connnection with Zeus that he deepens the conception of deity as such, raising him to the plane of a spiritual entity when he describes his nature as "somehow thought" [44] and clarifying his relation to the standard ethical (and political) values like Justice and sophrosyne — also to charis.[45] "No violent force" (bia) "does he array" — it is the early stage of Zeus' reign which is characterized by his use of Kratos and Bia as his henchmen.[46] In the Eumenides Zeus works through a democratic process and through persuasion (*peitho*), the latter being administered by Athena.[47] The central position of Zeus in Aeschylus' thought, the moral ideas which the poet, following in the footsteps of Homer, Hesiod, and Solon, associates with his reign are generally known: they have received new emphasis in Professor Rose's paper, whereas our own aim is rather to point out that Aeschylus' conception of Zeus is only one facet — though indeed the most important — of his religion. In

[43] Suppl. 525 f.

[44] Suppl. 100 where φρόνημα may however be an accusative. The text remains uncertain.

[45] Cf. Ag. 176 ff., 182 f., 361 ff., 1563 f., Cho. 949 ff. Many more passages could be cited, but what is most needed at present is a closer coördination between characteristic passages and the analysis of entire plays.

[46] Suppl. 97, Prom. 1 ff.

[47] Cf. vv. 885, 970 ff.

accordance with this declared purpose of our study we wish here to emphasize that side by side with the new character of Zeus older beliefs maintain their vitality. Zeus had been the protector of suppliants and strangers long before *Dike* became the symbol of his reign. As *Dike* expands her domain she may take charge even of these functions which originally came rather within the sphere of Themis and reflected Zeus' association with this goddess.[48] In the Suppliants Zeus' character as Xenios and Hikesios is repeatedly and emphatically brought to bear upon the issues of the play.[49] I am not sure that we have a right to call these characters secondary in importance even to the fundamental motifs of his fatherhood of the race of Io and his concern over the interests of *Dike*.

If we aimed at completeness we should have to include other phases and strata of Greek religion of which Aeschylus likewise allows us glimpses. We should, for instance, have to discuss Aeschylus' conception — or conceptions — of the *daimon* and to inquire into the functions of *Alastor*. Professor Rose has made some good points on the Erinys, expressing his conviction that for Aeschylus she "is a power which really exists." [50] The Kommos at the tomb of Agamemnon in the Libation-Bearers and the following iambic section in which Orestes and Electra establish contact with the spirit of their father and assure themselves of his support [51] would be meaningless unless the continued power of the dead were also something that "really exists" and is able to assert itself among the living. Incidentally, in this scene not only Persephassa but also Gaia is asked to release Agamemnon so that he may "see," i.e. aid the fight.[52] Gaia is here thought of in terms somewhat different from those in which we should understand her function in Prometheus Bound: for when her name occurs in that play the reference is indeed to her mythological role (in Rose's sense of the word) whereas in the Libation-Bearers

[48] See Suppl. 701–709, a passage with which we may contrast ibid. 360 or Pind. Ol. 8.21.

[49] See esp. vv. 343, 381, 385, 478, 615 f., 641; cf. 627, 271 f., 313 ff. The chorus of Agamemnon sees the hand of Zeus Xenios in the fate of Troy (v. 362).

[50] See esp. p. 16.

[51] Cho. 306–509. Cf. the Darius scene in the Persians.

[52] Cho. 489; cf. Pers. 629 (Persephassa: Cho. 490).

she is approached in a religious spirit.[53] If we refuse to make a gratuitous and unwarranted distinction between Aeschylus the poet and Aeschylus the thinker we may confidently say that the strata of Greek religion which his tragedies embody are strata of his own religion too.

If so many "forms" and facets of Greek religion are enshrined in Aeschylus' tragedies his work cannot be regarded as a temple erected for one particular god, least of all for one god in a specific function, but rather as a great Pantheon providing room and spheres of activity for a large variety of religious entities differing widely from one another in origin, conception, and type. Archaic and novel powers may join forces to support the same cause, or old and new deities may oppose each other in a vigorous fight for their respective prerogatives.[54] It would be a simplification — nay a falsification — to say that before the poet's own great conception of Zeus' world order everything else shrinks to insignificance. Would this view be borne out by the Eumenides, the last play of the only trilogy that is preserved entire and perhaps, though not certainly, also the latest of Aeschylus' plays that we have? No doubt, the play may be read as exalting the justice of Zeus which saves Orestes (thanks to specious arguments, some interpreters tell us) and at the same time establishes a new and brighter era for mankind. Critics are probably now unanimous in understanding the play along such lines and I have no intention of challenging the established opinion. It is also perfectly true that we hear nothing in this play about the *theoi genethlioi*; Orestes does not, like the maidens in the Suppliants, remind Zeus that he is the ancestor of his *genos* — in fact nobody anywhere in the trilogy seems to remember this tie between Zeus and the Atride family; the interest which Zeus in the Libation-Bearers [55] is supposed to have in the preservation of Agamemnon's progeny is of a different kind. Are the *theoi poliouchoi* likewise

[53] Pr. 209 f., 217, 1092 (a role of Gaia in the sequel is attested by her inclusion in the *prosopa*); Cho. 127 f., 489; see also Sept. 16 ff. For again a different aspect of *Ge Meter* see Sept. 16, also Suppl. 890 f. (899 f.); see further ibid. 116.

[54] For the former situation cf. the Kommos of the Choephori which includes appeals to the Moirai, Gaia, the *phronema* of the dead father, the *chthonioi theoi*, the 'curses of the slain,' Zeus, *Dike*; for the latter cf. the Eumenides.

[55] See esp. Cho. 246 ff.

absent? To be sure, nobody turns to them with prayers, yet is there no significance in the fact that it is Pallas Athena who sets up the Areopagus assuring Athens of a glorious future as long as the city maintains the spirit of this institution unadulterated, and who secures for the citizens the promise of rich blessings and prosperity which are in the gift of the Erinyes.[56] The Erinyes themselves change from demons of vengeance and destruction into friendly and helpful deities at the moment when they accept the new domicile in Athens, the "pride of the Greek gods whose altars it guards" in which also Athena, Zeus and Ares have made their home.[57] Athens is truly a "fortress of the gods." [58] Clearly the traditional concept of *theoi poliouchoi* has here been filled with new life and meaning. A relationship between the city and its *poliouchoi* is no longer simply taken for granted as in the Seven Against Thebes [59] but a new relationship with new *poliouchoi* is before the eyes of the spectators established under the happiest auguries.[60]

The play ends with a torchlight procession by which the new divine inhabitants are led to their seats on the slope of the Acropolis. All this happens after the new bulwark of Athens, the Areopagus, to which the gods themselves delegate the decision of the pending case, has started on its important career by pronouncing its verdict on Orestes. We must try to visualize this act of justice, the concern of the Polias over the future of Athens and the incorporation of the Erinyes into the life of the city as closely related, somehow interdependent, developments.[61] The introduction of justice into the civil and political life of Athens is the prior condition for the blessings which are lavished upon the city by her new *metoikoi*. Aeschylus has as little lost sight of this facet of Athenian religion as he has forgotten that tragedy forms part of a religious festival, an event by which the city reassured herself of her close connection with her gods. If the chorus of the

[56] Eum. 681–706, 794 ff., cf. vv. 921 ff., 970 ff.

[57] Eum. 961 ff.

[58] Eum. 919.

[59] See above, p. 215.

[60] Cf. especially vv. 916 ff., 1016 ff.

[61] Cf. Hes. Op. 225 ff. "Those who give straight judgments to strangers and to the men of the land and do not go aside from what is just, their city flourishes and the people prosper in it. Peace . . . the nurse of children is abroad in their land. . . . Neither famine nor disaster ever haunt men who do true justice. . . ."

Oresteia no longer enter the stage with the customary song of praise for these gods but instead exalt Zeus as the great educator of mankind [62] the end of the trilogy does more than make up for this loss of a traditional "form" by convincing us that the ties between Athens and her gods are stronger than ever. Tragedy instead of merely accepting the existence of these ties is able to fasten them anew — though only Aeschylus', not Sophocles' or Euripides' tragedy can do this. The Justice of Zeus, which has finally come into her own, and Athens' relation to her divine protectors [63] are fused in one great synthetic conception.

[62] Cf. Fraenkel, loc. cit. (Note 19) esp. 14 ff.

[63] Note v. 1001, "Nestling beneath the wings of Pallas, the Father holdeth ye in reverence" (H. W. Smyth's translation which has been used repeatedly in this paper).

THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH TO AUTOLYCUS

ROBERT M. GRANT
University of the South

I. Usage and Composition

The three books to Autolycus of Theophilus of Antioch enjoyed a considerable measure of popularity among later Christian writers. His work was used not only by Greek but also by Latin writers. Eusebius found it in one of the libraries he used, probably at Caesarea;[1] it was also employed by Methodius, Epiphanius, Procopius of Gaza, and John of Damascus.[2] Novatian, Lactantius and Jerome certainly knew his writings; probably Minucius Felix should be added to the list.[3] Three manuscripts of the Ad Autolycum survive; two are copies (one incomplete) of a third, an eleventh or twelfth-century manuscript now in Venice.[4]

In recent years the microscopic investigations of Loofs [5] have raised a new problem: the relation of Theophilus to Irenaeus. Most students [6] have rejected his arguments without explaining the striking resemblances between the two authors. Let us first examine the dates of Irenaeus' work and of Theophilus'. As for Irenaeus, the five books Adversus haereses were apparently written in their present order, and Book III was written in the time of Eleutherus (iii 3); but this date is too vague to help us. In Adv. haer. ii.22.2 he refers to a persecution, probably under Marcus Aurelius, who died in the year 180, while another passage (iv.30.1) perhaps refers to the influence of Marcia upon Com-

[1] Eusebius, HE iv. 24 (cf. vi. 20. 1, 32. 3).

[2] N. Bonwetsch, Die Theologie des Methodius von Olympus (Göttingen, 1903), 163f.; U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Ein Stück aus dem Ancoratus des Epiphanios," SB Berlin 1911, 759–72 (cf. also Panarion, ed. Holl, I 169:14, 171:3, 217:6, 378:19); Procopius, Comm. in Gen. ii (MPG 87^1, 157B, 164B; cf. M. Richard, "Les fragments exégétiques de Théophile d'Alexandrie et de Théophile d'Antioche," RB 47 [1938], 387ff.); K. Holl, Fragmente vornicänischer Kirchenväter aus dem Sacra Parallela (TU 20^2, 1899) 56f.

[3] Novatian, De trinitate 2; Lactantius, Div. inst. i. 23. 2; Jerome, De viris inlustr. 23; Minucius Felix, Octavius xviii. 10.

[4] Professor Jaeger suggests a date later than the eleventh century.

[5] F. Loofs, Theophilus von Antiochien adversus Marcionem (TU 46^1, 1930).

[6] In most detail, F. R. M. Hitchcock, "Loofs' Theory of Theophilus of Antioch as a Source of Irenaeus," JTS 38 (1937), 130ff., 255ff.

modus. Therefore Book II may have been written before 181, Book IV after 182.[7] Irenaeus' writing career lasted a long time, if it is possible to date the Epideixis as late as 200. The final publication of Adversus haereses need not be placed very many years earlier.

Compared with Irenaeus' orderly work, the apology of Theophilus is somewhat unsystematic. The first book is an apology complete in itself; he calls it a ὁμιλία (II 1); it is close to the diatribe. The second book he calls a treatise (σύγγραμμα); it also could stand alone. The third book is a ὑπόμνημα, a collection of materials or memoranda.[8] It is a composite book; the first fifteen chapters deal with Christian morality, while chapters 16–29 are concerned with proving Christianity older and truer than all the poets and other writers. The only precise notice for dating these books is found in III 27, where the chronography of Chryseros the Nomenclator ends with the death of Marcus Aurelius (March 17, 180). This part of Book III was therefore not finished before that date. About the same time there was a persecution of the Christians (III 30). Here Theophilus may be referring to the martyrdoms at Scilli on July 17, 180, or to later events. But what of the other books? The self-sufficiency of Book I makes it likely to have been composed first. It may have been Theophilus' first effort. And it is noteworthy that its rationalistic tone is considerably diminished in the other two books. Unfortunately the first book provides no clear evidence for its date.

The second book develops themes touched upon in the first, and after an attack on pagan gods leads up to an interpretation of the beginning chapters of Genesis. This is reinforced by quotations from the Sibylline Oracles and an anthology of Greek poetry. There is no way of dating the book. (The same observation applies to the first half of Book III.)

We may conclude that Irenaeus might well have known the first two books Ad Autolycum, but that they are not likely to have formed the core of his own work. In the first place, a detailed analysis of the principal passages claimed by Loofs reveals

[7] On these dates see F. Vernet, "St. Irénée," Dict. de théol. cath. VII 2400ff.

[8] Archytas in Diogenes Laertius viii. 80; H. J. Cadbury in F. J. F. Jackson-K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity II (London, 1922), 9ff.

striking differences. In the second place, why would Irenaeus have wanted to use Theophilus' work? The theological outlooks of the two writers are dissimilar. Irenaeus has the peace and certitude of a born Christian;[9] Theophilus is a convert who has read himself into the church (I 14). Irenaeus stands for what he knows as Christian tradition;[10] Theophilus seems to be working out his own theology. At the most important point where Theophilus shows theological originality — his application of the Stoic-Philonic distinction between the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and λόγος προφορικός to Christ (II 22) — Irenaeus explicitly rejects his idea.[11]

In briefly examining the composition and usage of Theophilus' three books we have come to the problem of his work as a theologian and apologist. First we shall examine his purely apologetic work, the first book to Autolycus, which was probably his earliest composition along these lines.

II. The First Book to Autolycus

The first book is an example of confused rationalism.[12] Theophilus begins with a broad discussion of the love of truth which he assumes animates Autolycus, and then, turning to his opponent's ironic demand, "Show me your god," impugns his morality. Only the pure in soul (heart, Matt. v.8) can see God. Your sins prevent the eyes of your soul from seeing (I 2). Here Theophilus is reinterpreting the vision of God in terms of the Philonic "eyes of the soul."[13] Autolycus cannot see, for he is disobedient to the law of God as set forth in the Decalogue. But he makes another request: "Show me the visible form of your god, since you see." Theophilus replies that the form of God is unspeakable and inexpressible. This idea is a commonplace of Judaism and early

[9] T.-A. Audet, "Orientations théologiques chez Saint Irénée," Traditio 1 (1943), 15ff.

[10] Ibid., 22f. Note the frequency with which Irenaeus refers to his teachers.

[11] Adv. haer. ii. 13. 2 (I, 282 Harvey), 28. 4f. (354f.); Audet, op. cit., 49f.

[12] Cf. O. Clausen, "Die Theologie des Theophilus von Antiochien," ZWT 46 (1903), 99; J. Lortz, Tertullian als Apologet II (Münster, 1928), 5.

[13] Conf. ling. 92, Mut. nom. 3; K. E. Kirk, The Vision of God (New York, 1932, 38. Theophilus seems to be replying to something like the attack of Celsus in Origen, Contra Celsum vi. 66 (p. 53. 4 Glöckner).

Christianity; it is found frequently in Philo, and according to John v.37 Jesus tells the Jews that they have never seen the "form" of God. Then follows a series of appellations of God with the corresponding attribute to which each refers. These appellations and attributes were common in Hellenistic Judaism and among early Christian apologists. The whole passage finds a striking parallel in Corp. Herm. ii.13 (p. 142:8 Scott). At the end of the series Theophilus happens to mention the wrath of God. "Then you will say to me, Is God angry? Very much so" (I 3). This surprising statement, contradictory to the philosophical definitions he is about to give, shows not only his boldness in countering unanimous philosophical opinion,[14] but also his incomplete synthesis of philosophical and religious ideas.

The next few lines (I 4) sound a great deal like a section from some manual of Stoic theology. But since the Stoic elements and the Jewish elements which follow are so closely connected, he probably found them already fused in Hellenistic Judaism where the ideas had been taken over and interpreted by Philo.

God has no beginning, for he is uncreated; he is unchangeable, for he is immortal. He is called God because he placed (τεθεικέναι) all things in his steadfastness, and because he runs (θέειν); θέειν is to run and to move and to be active and to nourish and to foresee and to govern and to make all things live. But he is Lord, because he rules over the universe; Father, because he is before all things; Fashioner and Maker, because he is creator and maker of the universe; Highest, because he is above all; Almighty, because he himself rules and embraces all things.

According to Athenagoras the Stoics considered God ἀθάνατος, ἀκίνητος, ἀναλλοίωτος, as well as ἀγένητος and ἀΐδιος. Zeno, Cleanthes, and Chrysippus called God ἀΐδιος, while Chrysippus applied the same epithet to Zeus and called him ἄφθαρτος. These attributes were taken from the Stoics by Philo, who calls God αἴδιος, ἄφθαρτος, and ἄτρεπτος. Similarly Justin calls God ἀγένητος and ἄφθαρτος. The word ἄναρχος is apparently not applied to God by Philo, though Leisegang's index is not complete, but it is so applied by Tatian and Clement of Alexandria. Like the other words here used to describe God, it probably comes to Theophilus from Stoicism. One of the etymological meanings of θεός perhaps comes to him from a Jewish source: the derivation from τίθημι, found as early as Herodotus, was taken over by Philo. But the other meaning, though

[14] Cicero, De offic. iii. 102; M. Pohlenz, Vom Zorne Gottes (Göttingen, 1909).

found in Plato, was exploited by Stoics: "θεοὺς dicunt (Posidonius and Cleanthes) sidera et stellas ἀπὸ τοῦ θέειν id est τρέχειν quod semper in cursu sint."[15] Then in the last sentence of this quotation Theophilus gives a list of five Hellenistic Jewish names of God: κύριος, πατήρ, δημιουργός, ὕψιστος, παντοκράτωρ with fairly obvious explanations of each one.

With these observations Theophilus touches briefly on creation. First, he believes, his argument can be still further improved by five parallels from the world of nature, four of which come from the Stoics probably through Philo.[16] He himself supplies a fifth. God is invisible; so is the soul, the helmsman, the sun, the king. Theophilus' own contribution is the parallel of the seed in the pomegranate (I 5) which reminds us of the Stoic comparison of God to honey in a honeycomb.[17] The comparison as he gives it is not quite right, for originally it must have been $\frac{\text{seed}}{\text{pomegranate}} = \frac{\text{man}}{\text{God}}$. Theophilus has to alter it to avoid identification of God with the world, and it now reads, "thus the whole creation is surrounded by the spirit of God, and the surrounding spirit with the creation is surrounded by the hand of God." But Logos and Sophia are the hands of God in II 18; and in II 10 Logos, spirit and Sophia are identified. Let us conclude that Theophilus' idea of the Spirit of God is somewhat unclear, especially in his first book.

In the sixth chapter of Book I, Theophilus' style abruptly changes. His writing takes on a liturgical tone. And his description of the wonders of creation is much like that found in the old Jewish prayers Christianized in Const. Ap. viii, 12.9–15.[18] The floridity of this liturgy is not "primitive"; but the church of Antioch in 180 was not primitive either. An anaphora including

[15] For the Stoics, M. Adler's index to Stoicorum veterum fragmenta (ed. H. v. Arnim); for Philo, H. Leisegang's index to Cohn and Wendland's edition of Philo; for the earlier apologists, E. J. Goodspeed, Index apologeticus (Leipzig, 1912). θεός from τίθημι: Herodotus ii. 52, Philo, Conf. 137; from θέειν: Plato, Crat. 397c–d, Macrobius, Sat. i. 23. 3.

[16] These four comparisons are to be found in Abr. 74–76.

[17] Zeno, SVF I 155.

[18] W. Bousset, "Eine jüdische Gebetssammlung im siebenten Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen," Nachrichten Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl. 1915, 435ff.; E. R. Goodenough, By Light Light (New Haven, 1935), 306ff. If my hypothesis be correct, the similarity between C. A. viii. 12. 19 and Ad Autol. II 27 noted by A. D. Nock-F.E. Brightman (JTS 30 [1928–29], 395) would be due to borrowing by Theophilus.

a fairly lengthy preface seems to have been known to Justin.[19] Theophilus undoubtedly rewrites the preface which he would employ in the Eucharist; but it must have been much like what we find in Ad Autolycum I 6, containing passing allusions to the cosmological chapters of Job and to the Psalms.

The next chapter combines thoughts of God as creator and of God as physician, who will "raise your flesh immortal with your soul." At that time "made immortal, you will see the Immortal." This is perhaps an interpretation of I John iii.3, "We shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is," in the light of I Corinthians xv.53f., according to which we shall "put on immortality."

In I 8 Theophilus insists on the necessity of faith. Here he is not far from the New Testament. At this point faith to him does not mean rational inference from analogies, but confidence. Faith in the latter sense is needed by farmers, sailors, sick men, and students, who trust respectively the earth, the boat and captain, the doctor, and the teacher.[20] Theophilus claims that one ought to trust God, for he made each man out of nothing (a man has no existence before that of his father and mother) and formed him out of a tiny seed, which itself once did not exist. Since the seed was not really created out of nothing, the oddness of this argument is obvious. Theophilus endeavors to prop it up by mentioning his opponent's belief in miracles worked by gods who are merely statues. But his conclusion — belief in resurrection — is hardly convincing.

Perhaps for this reason Theophilus turns aside to attack the gods as deified dead men. A resounding list of false gods, false because vulnerable, was becoming a tradition of Christian apologetic. It could lead to the conclusion (I 10) that these are not gods, but "images, the works of men's hands" (Ps. cxiii.4, cxxxiv. 15) and "unclean demons" (Ps. xcvi.5). The perennial question of emperor-worship is briefly discussed, and the usual answer, that he deserves "legitimate honor," is given (I 11).

A brief transitional chapter (I 12) seems awkwardly placed. The subject looks back to the beginning of the apology, and might

[19] Dial. 41 (p. 138 Otto); cf. I Clement xix–xx, and G. Bardy, "Expressions stoiciennes dans la 1ª Clementis," Rech. de science rel. 13 (1922), 73ff.

[20] Otto (ad loc.) observes that this is a common patristic argument.

well have been discussed there. The name "Christian" is not absurd, but very suitable because of six parallels. (Theophilus does not mention the name of Christ.) The improvement resulting from the use of chrism is evident in the case of ships, towers, houses, human beings, and statues. It is perhaps less evident that air and earth are "anointed" by light and spirit. And Theophilus concludes with an invitation to Autolycus to become anointed with the oil of God.

Finally we are able, thus prepared, to discuss the question of resurrection (I 13). "Show me even one man raised from the dead, so that seeing I may believe," says Autolycus. Unlike Quadratus, the earliest apologist, or even Irenaeus,[21] Theophilus is unable to bring forth any examples. He contents himself with three somewhat inconsistent preliminary rebuttals. Faith is of no value where there is evidence;[22] moreover you accept the "resurrections" of Heracles and Asclepius; finally you would probably not accept the evidence if I did provide it. Nevertheless — and here we come to the apologetic argument — God has provided many analogous examples. Theophilus, following the apologetic tradition,[23] sets forth four of them. There are "resurrections" of seasons, days and nights; of seeds and fruits, of the moon (monthly); and of the invalid who first loses weight and then regains it. Theophilus sees that the last example may be almost too natural, for the regained weight is due to foods; but he expresses belief that the work of restoration is God's.

An example of his rationalistic tendency may be seen in the discussion of seeds. They sometimes are swallowed by a sparrow or some other bird, then eliminated in deserted places, where they grow into trees. In I Clement xxiv–xxv seasons and seeds are followed by the example of the phoenix, from the corruption of whose flesh "there springs a worm" which turns into another phoenix. Does Theophilus, sceptical of the existence of the phoenix, alter the content of the story?

[21] Quadratus in Eusebius, HE iv. 3. 2; Irenaeus, Adv. haer. ii. 32. 4.

[22] Probably Theophilus is working over John xx. 29; in I 14 he paraphrases John xx. 27.

[23] I Corinthians xv, I Clement xxiv–xxv, Justin, Apol. i. 19, etc. See P. Nautin, Je crois à l'Esprit Saint dans la Sainte Église pour la Résurrection de la chair (Paris, 1947), 30–32.

His concluding chapter (I 14) combines personal testimony to his conversion by reading the prophets and finding their predictions fulfilled in order (τάξει) with a warning about the future punishment they foretold.

The lack of intellectual rigor in this brief apology is evident. Theophilus' stress on arguments for the excellence of the name "Christian" reveals his wounded self-esteem; but hardly impresses the reader favorably. Where he adds his own contributions to the apologetic tradition we find them unconvincing (pomegranate-seed, sparrow, sick man). He cannot finally distinguish between Christian and philosophical "faith"; he would agree with Aristotle that "faith is a sort of demonstration." [24] Unfortunately Theophilus' demonstrations do not demonstrate. Perhaps aware of his unconvincingness as a philosopher, in his later works he lays greater stress on revelation.

III. Commentary on Genesis; Christian Ethics

Most of the second book to Autolycus is concerned with the book of Genesis and its proper interpretation. In imperial times an interest in cosmogony was widespread,[25] and the book of Genesis was much admired and criticized.[26] Christians wrote commentaries on the hexaemeron,[27] sometimes highly speculative.[28] One of the most rationalistic, that of Hermogenes, was attacked not only by Tertullian [29] but even by Theophilus himself. According to Eusebius [30] the three books to Autolycus were different from the one against the heresy of Hermogenes, in which testimonies from the Apocalypse of John were used. But the commentary in Book II to Autolycus may well have provided The-

[24] Rhet. i. 1. 11, p. 1355a; cf. R. E. Witt, Albinus and the History of Middle-Platonism (Cambridge, 1937), 33f.; SVF III 548 (p. 147:10); E. Aleith, Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche (Berlin, 1937-Beih. ZNW 18), 39.

[25] A. D. Nock, "The Genius of Mithraism," JRS 27 (1937), 111; A. Heidel, The Babylonian Genesis (Chicago, 1942), 65f.

[26] De sublimitate ix. 9 (p. 19 Jahn-Vahlen); Numenius, in Clement, Strom. i. 150; Corp. herm. i, iii; Galen, De usu partium xi. 14 (II, 158 Helmreich).

[27] Rhodo (Eusebius, HE v. 13. 8), Apion, Candidus (v. 27); F. E. Robbins, The Hexaemeral Literature (Chicago, 1912).

[28] E. g., Simon Magus (Hippolytus, Ref. vi. 15), Satornilus (Irenaeus, Adv. haer. i. 24. 1 [I, 196]), Marcus (i. 18. 1 [169].

[29] Adv. Hermogenem.

[30] HE iv. 24.

ophilus with materials for later use against Hermogenes; it may be a first draft, since in II 28 (p. 136 Otto) the serpent is called demon and dragon (cf. Apoc. xii.9). In any event, the relation between Ad Autolycum II and Adversus Hermogenem must have been close.

The chapters (9–33) of exegesis of Genesis contain the passages of Theophilus most frequently cited by later writers, and they reveal him as the forerunner of the later Antiochene school of scriptural interpretation.[31] In them, as in the work of the later Antiochenes, there is a strong note of literalism and a clear reliance on Jewish exegesis.

Man begins from a foundation when he starts to build, but God's greater power is shown in his beginning not only ex nihilo but from above; for the heaven was made first in place of the roof.[32] Then came earth (the soil and foundation), abyss (the multitude of waters), darkness (caused by the heaven which God made, severing the waters and the earth like a lid), spirit borne above the waters (animating the creation, like the soul in man). This spirit is subtle and the water is subtle, so that the spirit nourishes the water and both of them, penetrating everywhere, nourish creation. The spirit had held the place [33] of light between the water and the heaven so that the darkness might not touch the heaven, which was nearer God.[34] The heaven was like a dome-shaped covering over lump-like matter. Then the command (Logos) of God shone like a lamp and illuminated this room-like region under heaven. (Moreover it was God who gave the names to created things, not man.) This heaven is invisible to us; the heaven we see is called "firmament," and half the water was taken up into it for rains, showers, and dews. The remaining half was left on earth for rivers, fountains, and seas. At first it

[31] On the text and canon of Theophilus see my article in JBL 66 (1947) ———. For the school of Antioch see L. Pirot, L'œuvre exégétique de Théodore de Mopsueste (Rome, 1913), 1–41; he does not mention Theophilus. On Jewish influence see C. H. Kraeling, "The Jewish Community of Antioch," JBL 51 (1932), 130ff.

[32] Reading (p. 94 Otto) *τόπον ἐπέχοντος ὀροφῆς*, against L. Paul in Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik 113 (1876), 115, and E. Bruhn in Commentationes philologae quibus O. Ribbeckio . . . congratulantur discipuli Lipsienses (1888), 496.

[33] Reading *τόπον* with Maranus and Otto against manuscripts' *τύπον*.

[34] Compare I 5 (the pomegranate).

covered the whole earth, especially hollow places, but then God through his Logos collected it in one place, and the previously dry land became visible, yet without form. Then God formed it and adorned it with herbs, seeds and plants (II 13). On the fourth day the luminaries were made, after plants and seeds. This order was intended to refute the opinions of philosophers who say that things growing on the earth are produced from the heavenly bodies. What is posterior cannot produce what is prior. These luminaries also contain the pattern and type of a great mystery: the sun is a type of God (surpassing moon in power and glory, remaining ever full and perfect) while the moon is a type of man (waning monthly, "dying," rising again). So the three days before the luminaries are types of the triad, God, Logos, Sophia. The fourth day is the type of man, who needs light. Moreover the arrangement of the stars is typical: the bright fixed stars are in imitation of the prophets; the less bright are righteous men; and wandering planets are a type of the men who have wandered from God and abandoned his law and commandments (II 15). The fifth day saw the production of the creatures which came out of the waters. God blessed them in order to show the future blessing of baptism. Carnivorous animals are types of robbers and murderers and godless persons, but in general the fish and reptiles "received no specially distinctive property" (II 16). On the sixth day God did not bless the animals he made but reserved his blessing for man. Quadrupeds are a type of men who mind earthly things, while birds are a type of those who fly upward in spirit. There are also birds which do not fly; these are sinful men. Wild beasts (*θηρία*) are so-called from their being hunted (*θηρεύεσθαι*) — for everything was originally good, but when man, the master of the house, sinned, the slaves naturally, sinned too. Therefore when man comes back to his original, natural condition, the animals will once more be gentle (II 17). Finally, man, the only work created by God's hands, Logos and Sophia, came into existence (II 18). "Man became a living soul"; therefore by most persons the soul is called immortal. And God placed him in the eastern regions, "excellent for light, brilliant with a very bright atmosphere, possessing the finest plants" (II 19).

For his exegesis Theophilus generally turns back to his Jewish or Jewish-Christian teachers. Almost everything in his exegesis can be paralleled in Jewish haggadic literature. His two heavens, the one invisible, the other visible, are found in the Septuagint reading of Genesis i.1, especially as interpreted by Philo, or in Deuteronomy x. 14 ("the heaven, and the heaven of heavens"), as interpreted by some of the Tannaite rabbis of the second century. The idea that God unlike man begins building from above is somewhat like the story in Bereshith Rabbah i.13: "The rabbis said, Mortal man builds an edifice, and if he succeeds according to his intentions he can widen it as the building rises; but if not, he must broaden it below and narrow it at the top. The Holy One, blessed be he, is not so, however." Indeed, one of the many points on which the first-century schools of Shammai and Hillel disagreed was that of the order of creation; the school of Shammai, like Theophilus, maintained that heaven came first.[35] "It is like a king who first made his throne and then his footstool, for it is written, 'The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool' (Isaiah lxvi.1)." The division of the waters into equal parts is also rabbinic.[36] And the idea that the waters were put half in the firmament and half on earth is paralleled in BR iv.4: "R. Johanan said, The Holy One, blessed be he, took all the primeval water and poured half in the firmament and half into the ocean." The collection of the waters was made by the Logos; in BR v.4 we read, "R. Levi said, Some interpreters, e.g. the Son of 'Azzai and the son of Zoma, interpret: The voice of the Lord became a guide to the waters, as it is written, 'The voice of the Lord is over the waters' (Ps. xxix.3)." Theophilus' idea that the creation of the sun and the moon on the fourth day refutes philosophers is not quite paralleled by a Jewish view:[37] "R. 'Azariah said in R. Manian's name, The orb of the sun alone was created to give light; yet if so, why was the moon created? Because the Holy One, blessed be he, foresaw that the peoples of the world would treat them as divinities. Said the Lord, If they are two, opposed to each other, and yet the peoples of the world treat them as divinities, how much more would they do so if there were but one!" The restoration to gentleness of wild animals is to be found in the prophetic writings (Isaiah lxv.25). Finally, man as the only work of both God's hands is found in the later than second-century Abot de-R. Nathan:[38] "How do we know that Adam was made by the two hands of God? Because it says, 'Thy hands have formed me' (Ps. cxix.73)." The "most

[35] BR i. 15; cf. L. Ginzberg, Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern (Berlin, 1900).
[36] BR iv. 5.
[37] BR vi. 1.
[38] Abot de-R. Nathan i. 18, p. 18 Pollak; Ginzberg, op. cit., 22.

persons" who considered the soul immortal are doubtless chiefly Greeks, but some Jews were included among them who so interpreted "Man became a living soul." [39]

Man, who was made by God's Logos and Sophia, was placed in a region to the east, after his formation. For he was made on the sixth day but formed only after paradise was made, after the seventh day (II 23). There were two trees in paradise which were unlike any others on earth — and paradise was on earth (not in one of the heavens). Three of the four rivers flowing out of Eden can be identified; Geon is the Nile, and certainly we know the Tigris and Euphrates, which lie at our borders (II 24). Man's duties in the garden were to keep the divine commandments. But Adam disobeyed. Though the tree of knowledge and its fruit were good, not deadly as some think,[40] his transgression brought death. Adam was still an infant, unable to receive knowledge rightly. God was not grudging to him, as some think; [41] God wanted to test him, to see if he would obey his commandment. Moreover he wanted man to remain simple and sincere, in infancy; and it is right for children to obey their parents, and not to know too much for their age. We grow in knowledge as in years. And when a law requires abstinence from something, the law is not the cause of punishment, but disobedience and transgression. For this cause Adam was ejected from paradise (II 25). But God was a great benefactor to man in his keeping him from being forever in sin. Therefore he punished him so that at some future time he might return to paradise. This is why in Genesis the story seems to show man placed twice in paradise: the first time was when he was placed there; the second will be fulfilled after the resurrection and judgment. Just as a defective potter's vessel is remoulded and made new and whole, so it happens to man in death. He is broken up so that at the resurrection he may be found healthy, i.e. spotless and just and immortal. God's question, "Where art thou, Adam?" (Genesis iii.9) is not really a question but a call to repentance and confession (II 26). Is man

[39] Compare Wisdom viii. 19f., ix. 15.

[40] Doubtless Marcionites; cf. Apelles in Ambrose, De paradiso vii. 35 (CSEL 32^1, 292:5).

[41] Probably Marcionites.

naturally mortal? Immortal? Nothing at all? No, he was made neither mortal nor immortal by nature. For if God had made him immortal from the beginning, he would have made him God; and if mortal, God would seem to be the cause of his death. God made him capable of either death or immortality; had he kept the commandment he would have been immortal. For God made him free and self-controlled. Though man acquired death for himself by his neglect and disobedience, God in his philanthropy and mercy gives him eternal life if he will obey the law and holy commandments which God gave us. He who keeps them can be saved and at the resurrection can inherit incorruption (II 27). After Adam was driven out of paradise he knew his wife Eve (Genesis iv.1). God made her from his rib, not because he could not form her separately, but because he knew that a multitude of gods were going to be introduced by men through the deceit of the serpent. For though God is one, even at that time deceit was undertaking to spread secretly a multitude of gods and to say, "Ye shall be as gods" (Genesis iii.5). In order to refute this idea God did not make man and woman separately. In fact the creation of the two of them, in order that there might be greater benevolence between them, demonstrates the mystery of the sole rule of God. Adam prophesied that man would leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife, which is actually the case. Eve was so called because she was deceived by the serpent and became the origin of sin; the evil demon who spoke through the serpent, and still works in men possessed by him, is also called Satan, demon and (from ἀποδεδρακέναι; he fled from God) dragon; he was originally an angel (II 28).

These six chapters describing the fall of man, like those interpreting the story of creation, are largely derived from Jewish sources. The tree of knowledge puzzled the rabbis; some said its fruit was wheat, others grapes. "R. 'Azariah and R. Judah b. R. Simon in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi said, Heaven forfend (that we should conjecture what the tree was): The Holy One, blessed be he, did not and will not reveal to man what that tree was."[42] Philo, on the contrary, takes the tree as an occasion for allegorization: "This description is, I think, intended symbolically rather than literally, for never yet have trees of life or of under-

[42] BR xv. 7.

standing appeared on earth, nor is it likely that they will appear hereafter." [43] Man's duty in the garden was to study and keep the Law.[44] The idea of Adam as an infant is implied in BR xxii.2: "R. Huma and R. Jacob in R. Abba's name said, No creature ever copulated before Adam; it is not written, man knew, but And the man; Knew intimates that he made known sexual functions to all." So Clement of Alexandria explains that before the fall Adam and Eve had no intercourse because they were children; their sin consisted in their premature marriage.[45] This view, which to some extent was shared by Irenaeus and other fathers, was rejected by Augustine, and is not now considered orthodox.[46] Not all the third century rabbis agreed that Adam was an infant: "R. Judah b. R. Simon said, Eve too was created fully developed. R. Johanan said, Adam and Eve were created as at the age of twenty." [47] Adam's return to paradise and God's goodness toward him were matters for discussion in the late second century: "R. Judah and R. Nehemiah differ. R. Judah said, He was sent forth from the garden of Eden in this world and the next. R. Nehemiah maintained, He was sent forth from the garden of Eden in this world, but not in the next. In R. Judah's view he laid a severe punishment upon him, while in that of R. Nehemiah he was lenient toward him. . . . When he created him, he created him by his attributes of justice and mercy, and when he banished him, he likewise banished him in accordance with his attributes of justice and mercy." [48] The closest parallel to Theophilus' idea of God as potter is to be found in Sirach xxxviii.29f., but it was common.[49] God knew where Adam was, but he wanted him to consider what he was. According to Philo, God uttered not a question but "rather a threat and a conviction." [50] "Neither mortal nor immortal" is a Hebrew idea, according to Nemesius, bishop of Emesa in Syria in the fourth century, though some Jews thought of Adam as created immortal.[51] Man's free will is stressed in a fourth-century interpretation: "R. Tifdai said in R. Aha's name, The Lord reasoned: If I create him of the celestial elements he

[43] Opif. 154.

[44] BR xvi. 5; cf. Ginzberg, op. cit., 38.

[45] Protr. xi. 111, Strom. iii. 94; 103.

[46] Irenaeus, Adv. haer. iii. 22. 4 (II, 124); Augustine, De peccator. merit. et remiss. i. 37 (MPL 44, 149); X. Le Bachelet in Dict. de théol. cath. I 370.

[47] BR xiv. 7.

[48] BR xxi. 7.

[49] Isaiah xiv. 9, lxiv. 8, Jeremiah xviii. 1ff., Test. XII Patr. Naphthali 2:2–5 (p. 45f. Charles), Romans ix. 21.

[50] Quaest. in Gen. i. 45, p. 30 Aucher.

[51] Nemesius, De nat. hom. 1 (p. 45 bot. Matthaei); Wisdom ii. 23f.; C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks (London, 1935), 160.

will live (forever) and not die; while if I create him of the terrestrial elements he will die and not live (in the future life)." [52] The idea that Eve was created from Adam to demonstrate that God is one is found in the Mishnah.[53] The picture of Adam as a prophet is derived from the deep sleep, like prophetic ecstasy, into which he fell.[54] The confusing sentence qualifying the "evil demon who spoke through the serpent" (II 28), partly based on Apoc. xii.9, is clarified by Clement: εὐα is the cry of Dionysiac enthusiasts.[55] The impossible etymology for δράκωδν is perhaps Theophilus' own.

Not all Theophilus' information about the past comes from the "prophets" of the Old Testament. Some of it is confirmed by the Sibylline Oracles, from which he gives three quotations (II 3,31, 36).[56] The Sibyl herself, unlike Greek poets and philosophers, was inspired by God in the same way as the prophets (II 9). Theophilus can even speak of "The Sibyl and the rest of the prophets" (II 38).

Presumably Theophilus writes his interpretation of Genesis in opposition to more speculative interpreters, even though he does not mention them. His preliminary refutation of the schools (II 4) includes an attack on Stoicism and Platonism which might well be aimed also at Hermogenes.[57] Perhaps relying on Hermas [58] he declares that the primary teaching of the inspired prophets is creation out of nothing, for there is not anything contemporaneous with God (II 10). Hermogenes denied this.[59] But in the exegesis proper Theophilus refrains from debate. His interpretation is addressed primarily to outsiders, who need not know anything about heresies except that they are like rockbound islands (II 14). The teachers of truth and the lovers of truth (II 14, cf. I 1) are to be found in churches.

Theophilus often tries to give a systematic, orderly picture of Christian thought. He collects "testimonies" about the Old Testa-

[52] BR xiv. 3.

[53] Sanhedrin iv. 5 (p. 388 Danby); Ginzberg, op. cit., 25.

[54] So the LXX renders Gen. ii. 21; a prophet in Clement, Strom. i. 135; Tertullian, De anima 21; Ginzberg, op. cit., 35.

[55] Protr. ii. 12.

[56] See J. Geffcken, Die Oracula Sibyllina (Leipzig, 1902), 227ff.

[57] E. Heintzel, Hermogenes der Hauptvertreter des philosophischen Dualismus in der alten Kirche (Berlin, 1902), 5.

[58] Mand. i.1; a favorite text of the ancient church.

[59] Tertullian, Adv. Hermogenem 2 (II, 340f. Oehler).

ment teaching concerning the "monarchy of God," the origin of the world, and the creation of man (II 35). In a later chapter (II 38) he presents passages of the Old Testament bearing on the destruction of the world by fire and on providence. This collection of quotations leads directly to further poetical verses which are derived from an anthology used constantly by Theophilus.[60] From this anthology he borrowed the idea of arranging verses topically, although Justin had already done the same thing.[61]

The second book to Autolycus is Theophilus' most sustained effort at writing theology. Like his apology (Book I), it is not altogether successful. Compared with the writings of Justin, of Melito of Sardis, even of Athenagoras, of Irenaeus, we feel that something is lacking. That something seems to be a firm grasp on the apostolic tradition. Apologetic convention is probably responsible for his failure even to mention the name of Jesus, for Tatian is similarly reticent. But just here we might have expected a successor of Ignatius to escape from convention into religious reality.

IV. Ethics and Chronology

Some characteristic writing of Theophilus is to be found in his last book to Autolycus. Here he combines apologetic arguments with not too intelligent use of a few sources, but produces results which on his own grounds are fairly satisfactory. Three topics are discussed: the folly of Greek philosophy and religion (1–8), the ethical quality of Christian teaching (9–15), and the antiquity of the biblical revelation (16–30).

His principal source for the opinions of philosophers is a doxographical work, a list of philosophers' opinions arranged by subjects. Unfortunately Theophilus is not content to copy this source; he feels that he must improve it. For example, to a list of those who recommend incestuous marriages he adds the name of Epicurus: "And Epicurus himself, along with his teaching atheism, advised intercourse with mothers and sisters, even in spite of the laws which forbid this" (III 6). As Diogenes Laertius x.118 makes clear, Epicurus' view was precisely the opposite. In dis-

[60] H. Diels in Rhein. Mus. 30 (1875), 177; A. Elter, De gnomologicorum graecorum historia atque origine (Bonn, 1893), 136.

[61] Justin, Apol. i. 15–17.

cussing atheists (III 7), Theophilus asserts that Plato regards the gods as material, that Pythagoras rejected providence, that Euhemerus said there were no gods and everything was governed automatically. This analysis is hardly correct. And Theophilus' denunciation of Greek religion is only slightly more interesting.

His discussion of Christian morality is more intelligent. In addition to his analysis of the Decalogue [62] he makes an effort to systematize Christian ethics. His model is the poetic anthology he so often employs. In chapters 11–14 he provides a discussion of four main headings of the law, thus anticipating the later Christian theory of the cardinal virtues.[63]

Heading	Biblical verse
μετάνοια	— Isaiah lv.6–7
	Ezekiel xviii.21–23
	Isaiah xxxi.6 and xlv.22
	Jeremiah vi.9
δικαιοσύνη	— Isaiah i.16–17
	Isaiah lviii.6–8
	Jeremiah vi.16 (also Ps.-Jerem.?)
	Hosea xii.6, xiii.4
	Joel ii.16
	Zechariah vii.9
σεμνότης	— Solomon: Proverbs iv.25–26
	Matthew v.28,32
	Solomon: Proverbs vi.27–29
(*φιλανθρωπία*)	— Isaiah lxvi.5
	Matthew v.44,46, vi.3
	Titus iii.1, I Tim. ii.1–2
	Rom. xiii.7–8

Such a fourfold division of virtues is originally Stoic,[64] but soon passed into Hellenistic Judaism where we find it in IV Maccabees i.2–4 (*φρόνησις, σωφροσύνη, δικαιοσύνη, ἀνδρεία*) and Wisdom vii.7. Philo found these four virtues in the four rivers flowing out of Eden.[65] Philo [66] also tells us that it was customary to

[62] See my article, "The Decalogue in Early Christianity," HTR 40 (1947), 1ff.
[63] K. E. Kirk, Some Principles of Moral Theology (London, 1920), 33ff.
[64] Stobaeus, Ecl. ii. 6. 5, Diogenes Laertius vii. 92.
[65] Leg. alleg. i. 63.
[66] Spec. leg. ii. 63.

divide synagogue lectures into two parts, one on the εὐσεβεία and ὁσιότης due to God and the other on the φιλανθρωπία and δικαιοσύνη due to men. Doubtless from such lectures Theophilus acquired not only his fourfold division of virtues but most of the texts to illustrate them. It is interesting to observe, however, that the last two virtues are illustrated by texts from both testaments. Such "syntheses" were produced in opposition to the Antitheses of Marcion in the latter half of the second century; they are intended to show the agreement of the Old Testament with the New. Such a collection is to be found in the lectures of the anonymous presbyter written down from memory by Irenaeus.[67] The four virtues themselves are "apologetic" in character; μετάνοια is substituted for φρόνησις, σεμνότης (μέχρις ἐννοίας) for σωφροσύνη, and φιλανθρωπία for ἀνδρεία. Thus the De Virtutibus of Philo is divided under the headings περὶ ἀνδρείας, περὶ φιλανθρωπίας, περὶ μετανοίας and περὶ εὐγενείας, and may originally have included a section περὶ εὐσεβίας.[68] Δικαιοσύνη had been included in the De Specialibus Legibus 136–238, as Philo himself says.[69]

I have discussed elsewhere the biblical and post-biblical chronology of Theophilus.[70] In it he makes use of three sources: the Bible, Josephus, and Chryseros the Nomenclator. To suspect him, as Werner does,[71] of the intention to provide an eschatological scheme, is over-subtle. It is just because he was unaware of the eschatological implications of a world-chronology that his work became useless for his successors. In conclusion, we may say that the third book to Autolycus is characterized by much of the same ineptness that we find in the other two. Why must Theophilus make mistakes in attacking philosophers? Why must he give the Decalogue without some of the commandments and with some "judgments" from Exodus xxiii? Why is Book III partly repetition of Book I and why does it discuss two very loosely related subjects, Christian morality and the antiquity of Israel? The answers to some of these questions probably lie in the environment at Antioch; others find their solution in the man himself. Brought

[67] Irenaeus, Adv. haer. iv. 32. 1 (II, 254).
[68] E. R. Goodenough, An Introduction to Philo Judaeus (New Haven, 1940), 52.
[69] Virt. 1.
[70] See note 31.
[71] M. Werner, Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas (Bern, 1941), 86.

to Christianity by reading the prophets under the guidance of Jewish teachers, interpreting Christianity apparently on his own, he developed a theological system which was purely individual and was not destined to remain Christian. Of his successor Maximus nothing is known. But the next bishop of Antioch, Serapion, had to write a book to Domnus, "who had fallen away from the faith of Christ at the time of the persecution to Jewish superstition." [72] It is tempting to find in Domnus a follower of Theophilus.

V. Theology

The theological outlook of Theophilus is strikingly like that of Paul of Samosata, whom Bardy describes as follows:

"Theologien d'occasion, le Samosatéen s'efforçait beaucoup plûtot de réconciler, sur le terrain de monothéisme, les croyances juives et païennes avec l'Évangile que de pénétrer la richesse de la foi catholique." [73]

We have already briefly considered Theophilus' discussion of the attributes of God and of God as creator; let us turn to his teaching concerning the "hands" of God — Logos and Sophia.

A. Logos

Though God himself is known through his works (I 4,5, II,10) and through the prophets inspired by him (II 9, III 17), Theophilus regards these activities of revelation as performed not directly by God himself, the one without beginning, changeless, immortal (I 4), but by his "hands" or powers, Logos and Sophia.

The chief interest to us in Theophilus' doctrine of the Logos is his distinction between the Logos ἐνδιάθετος and the Logos προφορικός, apparently first made in the third century B.C. by the Stoic Chrysippus. In Stoic and other philosophical thought after his time Logos as a psychological term meant both reason and voice or word. Within man it was reason, and expressed reason became voice or word. Logicians made a distinction between courses of study intended to train the mind and those to train the voice. Sextus Empiricus, following Chrysippus, says that man

[72] Eusebius, HE vi. 12. 1.

[73] G. Bardy, Paul de Samosate (Bruges, 1923), 33; cf. Epiphanius, Pan. haer. lxv. 2 (III 4:16 Holl).

does not differ in his προφορικὸς λόγος (voice) from the irrational animals — for crows and parrots and magpies utter distinct sounds — but in his ἐνδιάθετος (reason). Also following Chrysippus, a scholion on the Theogony of Hesiod identifies Iris with the προφορικὸς λόγος since εἴρω is the same as λέγω. And Galen says that "the philosophers" distinguish between the two logoi. The distinction is also to be found in Plutarch, as well as in the allegorists Cornutus and Heraclitus [74] who identify Hermes with the power of speech. In Philo there are many references to this distinction: for example, in the Vita Mosis ii.129 he states that there are two logoi for each of us, the προφορικός and the ἐνδιάθετος. The former serves for explanation, the latter for truth. God too has a Logos, but Philo avoids dividing it as he does its human counterpart.[75]

In the early Christian apologists this distinction is transferred to the divine Logos. Justin [76] compares the generation of the Logos to our human experience. When we express some logos (thought) we beget a logos (word); but it is not diminished in the process. Tatian [77] draws a similar parallel. And Athenagoras [78] says that the Logos was the first-begotten of the Father, but not as a creature, for from the beginning God, being eternal Nous, had the Logos (reason) in himself, for he is eternally reasonable. Here the distinction between ἐνδιάθετος and προφορικός is at least implicit, and as Geffcken [79] points out, the expression "first-begotten" is taken from Justin, while the general idea seems to be Philonic. Such speculation was current to such an extent that Irenaeus devotes considerable space to rejecting these anthropomorphisms.[80] God's thoughts are not like those of men. While his condemnation is directed against the Valentinians it probably includes the speculations of the apologists as well. Similarly Clement [81] remarks that "we maintain that the essential Logos is God in God, who is also said to be 'in the bosom of the

[74] SVF II 223, 137, 135; Plutarch, De Iside 7; Cornutus, Theol. gr. 16; Heraclitus, Quaest. homer. 72.

[75] Spec. leg. iv. 69, Mos. ii. 127–29; J. Drummond, Philo Judaeus II (London, 1888), 172ff.

[76] Dial. 61:2.

[77] Ad Gr. 5 (p. 6:4 Schwartz).

[78] Leg. 10 (p. 127:27 Geffcken); cf. G. Bardy, Athénagore (Paris, 1943), 56ff.

[79] Zwei griechische Apologeten (Leipzig-Berlin, 1907), 181.

[80] See note 11.

[81] Excerpta ex Theodoto 8 (p. 46 Casey).

Father,' continuous, undivided, one God." The expression "essential" is an attempt by Clement to avoid the term ἐνδιάθετος.

This distinction is made by Theophilus in II 10, "God having his own Logos ἐνδιάθετος in his own bowels begot him with his own Sophia,[82] bringing him forth before everything," and in II 22, where the voice which Adam heard in Eden was the Logos, God's son. Originally the Logos was always ἐνδιάθετος in the heart of God; it was his counsellor, mind and understanding (φρόνησις). "When God desired to make what he wished, he begot this Logos προφορικός, the firstborn of all creation,[83] not emptying himself of Logos (reason), but begetting Logos (a word) and conversing with his Logos continually" (II 22). Then follows a quotation from the first chapter of the Fourth Gospel; but clearly the emphasis is laid on the phraseology of Stoic psychology. The ambiguity of the Logos Christology comes from the ambiguity of the Greek word, and the decline of the doctrine was due to this confusion.

Theophilus, in formulating his Logos doctrine, is primarily interpreting the words of scripture, though in terms derived from Stoic-Philonic psychology. Few of the functions of the Logos are assigned to the Logos ἐνδιάθετος. Like reason in man it is situated in God's bowels (II 10) or heart (II 22). This idea is derived from the primitive psychology of the Old Testament.[84] It is always with him (II 10,22); it is his counsellor, mind, understanding (σύμβουλος, νοῦς, φρόνησις II 22). It is the ἀρχή in which God made heaven and earth (II 13). This interpretation of Genesis i.1 and Proverbs vii.22 apparently begins in Colossians i.16–18,[85] and is very common in early Christianity; ordinarily the "beginning" is referred to the Logos as Son.[86] In Theophilus'

[82] On such triads see H. Usener, "Dreiheit," Rhein. Mus. N.F. 58 (1903), 1ff., 161ff., 321ff. Cf. also Athene, who according to Pseudo-Heraclitus 20 and other Stoic writers is φρόνησις; following Chrysippus, Diogenes of Babylon "in eo libro qui inscribitur de Minerva partum Iovis ortumque virginis ad physiologiam traducens diiungit a fabula" (Cicero, De nat. deor. i. 41; cf. Cornutus 20 [p. 35:6 Lang]).

[83] Colossians i. 15.

[84] As a Greek writer, Theophilus is not quite accurate in his exegesis, for the bowels should be the seat of emotion rather than of reason (see H. Lesêtre in Dictionnaire de la Bible II 1817f.). I owe this observation to the Rev. R. L. Hicks.

[85] C. F. Burney, "Christ as the APXH of Creation," JTS 27 (1925–26), 160ff.

[86] Aristo of Pella (Routh, Reliq. sacr. i. 95); Tatian, Ad Gr. 5; Irenaeus, Epid. 43; etc.

exposition the Son is mentioned only once and then it is made clear that he is the "voice" (Logos προφορικός) of God, which Adam heard in the garden (II 22). Before its generation or utterance by the Father, the Logos was not a person distinct from him. It was essentially one of his attributes (I 3).

When God desired to create the world, however, he generated or uttered the Logos, which then became προφορικός. The process was not effected all at once, however, for God brought the Logos (and Sophia) into being before everything else (II 10). Through the Logos he created the world. At this point the fundamental ambiguity of the term Logos becomes evident, for the Logos is no longer merely God's reason — though it always remains to converse with him (II 22) — but also his command (διάταξις II 13) and voice (φωνή II 22). Clearly here Theophilus is interpreting the prologue to the Fourth Gospel, where at the beginning was the Logos and the Logos was πρὸς τὸν θεόν and the Logos was the true light. And this prologue itself is an interpretation of Genesis i.1–13; the Logos, as Theophilus says, is the command of God, shining like a lamp in an enclosed room, lighting the regions under heaven (II 13). By his Logos God brought together the water into one place (II 13). The three timeless days before the luminaries were made are types of God and his Logos and his Sophia (II 15). In fact God made everything by his Logos; but he considered everything as by-products; the only eternal [87] work of his hands was man. Yet he did not [88] say, "Let us make man according to image and according to likeness" as if he needed assistance; for he said "Let us make" to none other than his own Logos and his own Sophia (II 18). The stress on "his own" makes it likely that Theophilus did not regard Logos and Sophia as helpers but as instruments of God's own will. The idea that God used instruments in creation is taken over from Platonism, where the instruments are really collaborators, by Greek-speaking Jews who wanted to explain away the anthropomorphic "hands" of God in the Old Testament.[89] When this interpretation of

[87] Reading ἀίδιον with manuscripts against ἰδίων of Gesner, approved by Loofs, op. cit., 68, and L. Paul, op. cit., 115.

[88] Supplying οὐχ with Loofs, op. cit., 68

[89] Timaeus 41c, 42e; Aristobulus in Eusebius, PE viii. 10. 7; Philo, Opif. 72ff.

Genesis i.26 as referring to the Logos, as in Justin, was taken over by Christians, conservative Jewish teachers rapidly rejected it. In Palestinian Judaism the doctrine of "two powers" was condemned by the rabbis,[90] and the teachers of Trypho interpreted this verse as addressed by God either to himself or to the elements from which man was to be made.[91] Other teachers explained it as God's giving an example to man by asking advice of the angels.[92]

The work of the Logos was not finished when it had played its part in the creation of man, for it was not God whom Adam heard or who walked in the garden of Eden, but the Logos in the person of God (*ἐνπροσώπῳ*). "Since the Logos is divine (*θεός*) and begotten of God, whenever the Father of All wishes he sends it to some place; when it arrives it is heard and seen — having been sent by him — and thus is found in once place" (II 22). Thus are explained the theophanies of the Old Testament; it was not the Father of All who appeared to men, but his Logos, in his form. Moreover the Logos inspired Moses, Solomon, and the prophets (II 10). The Logos came down on them[93] and through them spoke forth the details of creation and everything else (II 10).

The Logos *προφορικός* or *φωνή* is also the *εὐαγγέλιος φωνή* (III 13). And therefore we may conclude that in II 22 among the appearances of the Logos is included that in Christ — whose name Theophilus never mentions. Such an appearance need not be an incarnation. As in the case of Moses (II 10) the Divine Logos could have spoken through Christ as through an instrument. But if it could appear in the person (*πρόσωπον*) of God, it could probably appear in the flesh; it could become flesh, as Justin[94] explicitly teaches. Though it is the Logos, not Christ, to whom Theophilus refers as the Son of God, his definitions are taken from the books of the New Testament, and he certainly knew the Fourth Gospel. Although he explains the Logos in Stoic terms, it comes to him from the Gospel of John.

[90] G. F. Moore, Judaism in the Age of the Tannaim I (Cambridge, 1927), 364.
[91] Justin, Dial. 62.
[92] Ginzberg, op. cit., 19ff.
[93] As the *ῥῆμα* came down on John the Baptist (Luke iii.2); *ῥῆμα* = *λόγος*: Jeremiah i. 1f., 4, etc.
[94] Apol. i. 5. 4, 66. 2.

B. Sophia

In the theology of Theophilus, Sophia is one of the two hands of God. Before the creation it was, like the Logos, within God (II 9,10); God begot it with the Logos before everything else. The function of Sophia was the ordering of the invisible heaven and the chaos which God had created by his Logos (I 7, II 33), for "God by Sophia founded the earth." [95] This "manifold Sophia of God" [96] gave names to all the component parts of the world. It prepared the parables of nature as proofs of the resurrection (I 13). It inspired the prophets (II 9), and it now purifies men's hearts and heals the eyes of their spirits (I 7).

Here as elsewhere Theophilus is reworking and interpreting Biblical materials. The idea of Sophia as a power separate from God is expressed in Proverbs vii.1–31, Sirach xxiv.1–22, and Wisdom of Solomon vii.22ff. In the New Testament of Theophilus, Christ is represented as Sophia in Matthew xi.28–30, a passage apparently based on Sirach li.33–34. In the Pauline epistles Christ is the Sophia of God (I Cor. i.24; Col. i.15–18); as Leisegang [97] suggests, the middle term by which Christ is equated with Sophia is πνεῦμα, for Christ is πνεῦμα in II Cor. iii.17. In Luke xi.49 Sophia is represented as speaking about the deaths of the prophets; it is not clear whether it is identified with Christ or not. In the Fourth Gospel, as Leisegang remarks,[98] the Logos takes over all the functions which Sophia and πνεῦμα had in Paul.

Theophilus was compelled to synthesize these divergent elements. While Philo has similar difficulties in equating Sophia and Logos and in keeping them distinct, Theophilus is rewriting not Philo but the New Testament. He is probably influenced by Wisdom ix.1–2, where God makes all things by his Logos and by (ἐν) his Sophia forms man. While this originally meant simply "with reason and in wisdom," a literal-minded theologian could interpret it more precisely.

According to Rendel Harris [99] Theophilus reached his theory

[95] Proverbs iii. 7, quoted in I 7.
[96] Ephesians iii. 10, quoted in I 6.
[97] H. Leisegang, "Sophia," RE III A 1034.
[98] Ibid., 1035.
[99] J. R. Harris, The Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel (Cambridge, 1917), 22.

of Logos and Sophia "by a bifurcation of the original Wisdom into Word and Wisdom, the τριάς being thus an evolution of a previous δυάς; if we prefer to put it so, we may say that Theophilus identified the Wisdom-Christ, now detached from the Logos-Christ, with the Holy Spirit." It might better be said that in reading the prophets of the Old Testament, especially Solomon, Theophilus found Sophia playing the rôle which, when he read the works of the inspired John, he found ascribed to Logos. In the two passages in which his logos-doctrine is most clearly presented (II 10,22) he is careful to state that Logos and Sophia are the same.

C. Spirit

To Theophilus "Spirit" has two meanings. In the first place it is the breath of God, which we ourselves breathe (I 7); it sustains the world and surrounds everything (I 5), like the anima mundi of the Stoics.[100] But the idea is essentially derived from the Bible; if God held his breath the world would perish.[101] This spirit is life-giving: at the creation it was borne over the waters so that it could nourish water and then with water nourish the whole creation; it could mingle with water because both water and spirit are fine or subtle elements (II 13). Before light came into existence, spirit between heaven and water kept darkness from touching God (II 13). After light shone forth, spirit with it "anointed" the air and everything under the heaven (I 12).

In the second place it is a medium of revelation, though not quite a personal agent like Logos or Sophia, both of whom are identified with it (II 10, I 7). "We Christians are taught by a holy spirit which spoke in the holy prophets and foretold everything" (II 33). This spirit gave the prophets the wisdom which is from God (II 9). The prophets are πνευματοφόροι. They became musical instruments of God (II 9, 10); this is a Stoic-Philonic idea.[102]

Spirit is not primarily a person or hypostasis; it is the life-giving breath of God (I 3), or, as the Stoics were accustomed to define it, a wind.[103] This idea is also characteristic of biblical

[100] Wisdom i. 9; Aetius, Plac. i. 6. 1 = H. Diels, Doxographi Graeci (Berlin, 1889), 292.
[101] Job xxxiv. 14, quoted in I 7.
[102] II 9, 22, III 12, 17; cf. P. Lejay in Bull. d'arch. chrét. 2 (1912), 43ff.
[103] Aetius, Plac. iii. 7. 2 (p. 374 Diels).

thought, since *ruach* in Hebrew means both "wind" and "spirit." Theophilus' idea of the subtlety of spirit doubtless comes from Wisdom vii.22–23, where it is stressed as one of the attributes of the spirit that is, or is in, Sophia.[104] He often identifies spirit with Sophia. In I 7 he shows that God made everything through his Logos and Sophia, for by his Logos the heavens were established and by his spirit all their might" (Psalm xxxii.6). In I 13 he refers to I Corinthians xii.11, "All these worketh the one and the same spirit," in the words, "All these worketh the Sophia of God." But the identification is not systematic or thoroughgoing. As Puech suggests,[105] Theophilus may prefer to work with the concept of Sophia as the third member of his triad rather than with that of Spirit because of the confusion involved in the latter term. But the triad is so fluid, since as Theophilus himself says (II 10) Logos is Spirit of God and Beginning and Sophia and Power of the Highest, that we cannot be certain.

Behind all his definitions lie the Christologies of the New Testament. It is Christ who is the Logos,[106] who is the Spirit,[107] who is the Beginning,[108] or in the Beginning,[109] and who is the Sophia of God and the Power of God.[110] In his doctrine of God and of what was to be known as the Trinity, Theophilus is not guided by the tradition of the church as was, for example, Irenaeus. He was an individual interpreter of the inspired writings.

D. Eschatology

Last of all we may consider Theophilus' interpretation of the final fate of man and the world. As in so many other instances, at this point Theophilus tries to combine Hebrew and Greek ideas. Following the Old Testament he says that man will be raised by God (I 7,8). In the resurrection is included every man (I 13), even those who are dead (II 38). On the other hand, man can in his lifetime become a god: γένηται θεός (II 27, compare II 24).

[104] Eusebius, PE vii. 12. 4, xi. 14. 4, reads "is a spirit." J. Fichtner, Weisheit Salomos (Tübingen, 1938), prefers the other reading.
[105] Histoire de la littérature grecque chrétienne II (Paris, 1928), 211.
[106] John i. 1, Apoc. xix. 13.
[107] II Cor. iii. 17.
[108] Gen. i. 1, Col. 1. 15, Apoc. xxii. 13.
[109] John i. 1.
[110] I Cor. i. 24.

This idea is Theophilus' expression of an idea which was becoming common in the Christian theology of his time. The idea of immortality (*ἀθανασία*) is rare in Christian literature until we reach the apologists; originally it was simply regarded as a gift from God to man. But in Hellenistic thought, as A. J. Festugière [111] remarks, "L'*ἀθανασία* suppose une *θεοποίησις*. Pour devenir immortel, il faut être dieu. Car l'immortalité, au sens plein, est un privilège strictement divin." He cites [112] the words of Hippolytus in On the Theophany: *εἰ ἀθάνατος, ἔσται καὶ θεός*. Even to Philo such a statement would have seemed difficult. "One must become God — which is impossible — in order to comprehend God." [113]

In regard to the fate of the world Theophilus stresses the *ἐκπύρωσις*, a phrase he takes from the Stoics along with much of its content. The destruction of the world by fire is not portrayed in the Old Testament. The fire in Malachi iii.19 and Isaiah xxx.28, 30, which Theophilus quotes, works only the destruction of the wicked, as does the "lake of fire" in Apoc. xix.20. But in the middle of the second century II Peter iii.10 states that at the day of the Lord "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat, and the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up." Apparently, however, Christians are to escape the "cosmic bonfire" in some way, and they "look for new heavens and a new earth" (II Peter iii.13). Very similar and perhaps derived from the epistle is the view of Theophilus, though he expresses it in Stoic terms as *ἐκπύρωσις* and *ἀποκατάστασις*. Justin had been aware of the similarity of Christian and Stoic teaching on this subject: according to him the Sibyl and Hystaspes had predicted the destruction by fire of all corruptible things, and the Stoics taught that God himself would be resolved into fire; yet Justin had rejected this view, for God is the creator, not the creation.[114] But while the Stoic *ἐκπύρωσις* and *ἀποκατάστασις* were to be recurrent phenomena,[115] in the opinion of Theophilus and other Christians they

[111] L'idéal religieux des grecs et l'évangile (ed. 2, Paris, 1932), 39; cf. R. Bultmann in TWzNT I 23ff.

[112] Festugière, op. cit., 40; Hippolytus, On the Theophany p. 262:9 Achelis.

[113] Frag. ii. 654 Mangey = Joh. Damasc., Sacra Parallela, MPG 96, 472A.

[114] Apol. i. 20. 1f.

[115] SVF II 625.

occur but once; there is to be one ἐκπύρωσις τοῦ κόσμου (II 37, 38) accompanied by one ἀποκατάστασις, when man will cease from sinning and the wild animals will become gentle again (II 17). For the wicked there waits an eternal fire (I 14). In Theophilus' mind, as in the Bible, it is not quite clear whether the renewal is to be on this earth, as paradise was (II 24), or in heaven.

VI. Conclusion

In his theological system Theophilus depends almost entirely on the Greek Old Testament and on the books which were coming to be regarded as the New Testament. In his interpretation of the Old Testament he relied on his Jewish teachers; Judaism was flourishing in Antioch at the end of the second century, and in several areas Christians and Jews were closely related. For the New Testament he relies on his own synthesis; while he knows the apology of Justin he makes almost no use of it. His doctrine of God, while essentially based on scripture, is so greatly influenced by Stoic and Hellenistic Jewish concepts that when he declares that God is angry at sinners the anthropomorphic expression is surprising. In his doctrine of the Logos he attempts to apply to the Logos of the Fourth Gospel the distinction of Stoic and Philonic psychology between the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and the λόγος προφορικός. In the Old Testament, especially the Wisdom of Solomon, and in some early Christian writings he found another hypostasis, the Sophia of God. He endeavors to explain Sophia as one of the two "hands" of God, the other being Logos; but since in Christianity the concept of Logos is fundamentally a development out of that of Sophia, and since in the New Testament they are both based on the person of Christ, this distinction was not destined to survive. Theophilus himself says that they are identical. His doctrine of Spirit is also based on the Old Testament, but since Sophia has taken its place in his τριάς, it becomes vague and contradictory.

The most important part of scripture to Theophilus was the cosmogony in Genesis. In his time a lively interest was taken in ancient oriental cosmogonies, and he sets forth the true one in his second book to Autolycus. His exegesis is sober and ordi-

narily literal, though he finds ethical meanings in the various kinds of animals which God made on the several days of creation. Almost every element in his exegesis can be paralleled in the haggadic interpretations of the rabbis. Concerning the fall of man and the early history of mankind Theophilus again follows Genesis as it was interpreted by the rabbis. His eschatology seems to be based on earlier Christian teachers, however, possibly, as for the coming ἐκπύρωσις, on II Peter. While he uses the Stoic terms, such as ἐκπύρωσις and ἀποκατάστασις, his teaching is grounded in a literal interpretation of the New Testament.

The few scholars who in recent decades have devoted special attention to Theophilus have received strikingly divergent impressions of his ability. H. Gelzer,[116] studying the chronographical work of Julius Africanus, mentions "den rohen chronologischen Versuch des Theophilos von Antiochien." Independent analysis confirms this judgment. His theological views have occasioned more discussion. Writing on the presentation of Christianity as monotheism in the Greek apologists, J. Lortz [117] remarks: "Am radikalsten unter den griechischen Apologeten ist in diesem Punkte Theophilus." O. Clausen [118] had earlier gone so far as to compare Theophilus' rationalism with that of Aristotle and the Stoa, and had said: "Ein 'christlicher' Charakter, — dies Prädicat ist dem Theophilus nicht vorzuenthalten." G. Bardy,[119] on the other hand, denies any originality to Theophilus.

Au lieu d'un système personnel, nous avons d'autant plus de chance de trouver chez lui le simple écho de l'enseignement traditionnel. Lors donc qu'il parle de la Trinité — et il est le premier auteur chez qui l'on trouve le terme de τριάς à propos de Dieu, — ou encore lorsqu'il explique que, quand Dieu voulut faire ce dont il avait le dessein, il engendra le Verbe en le proférant (τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ἐγέννησε προφορικόν), — et il est aussi le plus ancient écrivain chrétien qui applique au Verbe cette épithète de couleur stoïcienne, — il ne fait rien d'extraordinaire; il emploie des mots déjà courant autour de lui; il se sert des formules que tout le monde, du moins dans les écoles chrétiennes, connaît à

[116] Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie I (Leipzig, 1880), 22.

[117] Tertullian als Apologet II (Münster, 1928), 5.

[118] "Die Theologie des Theophilus von Antiochien," ZWT 46 (1903), 99.

[119] Paul de Samosate (Bruges, 1923), 148f.

Antioche; et voilà qui doit mettre en garde tous les chercheurs de nouveautés.

Unfortunately there is no evidence for this view, or even for the existence of Christian schools at Antioch.

Only one critic, F. Loofs,[120] who was attempting to prove the dependence of Irenaeus on Theophilus, has become extravagant in speaking of his ability. "Als Schriftsteller wie als Theologe grösser war als Irenaeus." To this statement W. Bauer [121] replies: "Mir fehlt noch der Ausgleich zwischen diesem den Irenaeus überragenden Theologen und dem flachen Schwätzer der Apologie an Autolykos." The severity of this condemnation is matched by a comment of V. Schultze,[122] to whom it "ausgeschlossen scheint, dass ein antiochenischer Bischof eine mit soviel Torheiten und Irrtümern gefüllte Schrift verfasst habe."

It is evident that most scholars have no very high opinion of Theophilus of Antioch. And the purpose of the present study has not been to present an apology for his work. But in the course of the analysis it has perhaps become clear that some of Theophilus' aberrations are due to his methods, and that these methods are the ordinary methods of his time. Most of his difficulties, however, are due to his own limitations. He was unable to understand clearly either the Christian faith or the Hellenistic philosophies opposed to it. For this reason his books to Autolycus were not influential in the history of Christian theology. Their value lies in their reflection of the beginnings of a learned theology. Theophilus was not successful; but he was a pioneer.

[120] Theophilus von Antiochien adversus Marcionem (TU 46², 1930), 431.
[121] Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum (Tübingen, 1934), 23.
[122] Altchristliche Städte und Landschaften III. Antiocheia (Gütersloh, 1930), 57.

THE CULTURAL MISSION OF RUSSIAN ORTHODOXY

ROBERT P. CASEY
Brown University

A generation ago the study of Russian church history was considered a highly specialized field. Outside Slavic lands little attention was paid to it and in Heussi's great compendium of church history the sections on Russia occupy hardly more than a page. Similarities and differences between Russian and Roman or Anglican theology interested enthusiasts for the restoration of unity between Eastern and Western Christianity and this led in some instances to serious historical study. The names of Palmer, Neale, Stanley and Fortescue in England, of Palmieri in Italy and d'Herbigny in France, not to mention other scholars associated with the excellent publications of the Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies, are familiar in this connection. The Ecumenical Movement after 1918 effected a wider and better understanding of the Russian Church especially in England and America. No general and popular interest, however, was stimulated or sustained.

What theologians and historians failed to accomplish, the Soviet Revolution brilliantly succeeded in achieving. Overnight the Russian Church lost all its privileges and most of its rights and the conflict between the Bolsheviks and Orthodoxy suddenly translated into violent action the theoretical opposition between secular minded Communism and the more conservative social ideologies with their varied attachments to religion. Liberals who had hoped that the attack might be limited to the Imperial Church were disappointed by an equally ruthless persecution of the sects as bulwarks of bourgeois interests. The Russian religious crisis became a paradigm of the whole conflict between secularism and religion and outsiders to Russian affairs took sides with a passionate animus hardly justified by their actual understanding of the facts.

After twenty years of continuous pressure, varying only in the

degree of its intensity, the Communist attack on religion in Russia subsided. It had exploited to the utmost the fanaticism engendered by revolutionary enthusiasm and rapid cultural achievement. It was supported by the only political party recognized in the country and by various state agencies acting under party control. It attempted to mobilize a youthful generation unexposed to the religious influences of their forebears and instructed in godlessness as a necessary condition of patriotism and as the first mark of good citizenship and good sense. The attack nevertheless failed. In the third decade of the history of the U.S.S.R., Orthodoxy, which was greatly enfeebled but never dead, revived and once more occupies a recognized and respectable position. Some of its property has been restored, its hierarchy functions and can renew itself in seminaries long-closed; the religious life is open once more to those whose vocations dispose them to it. After years of the narrowest restrictions the church again instructs by the printed and spoken word. The old temporal privileges have gone along with the political and social system of which they were a part. The church having recognized the new state is on its own premises bound by a loyalty to it but in the practice of religion the church is free and its life is sensibly increasing in vigor year by year.

It is obvious that an institution capable of withstanding the onslaught of the revolutionary years in Russia, possessed remarkable vigor and inner vitality. If the forces of suppression were great, the forces being suppressed were greater. If the triumph of Communism over imperialism and the imperialist church was dramatic and significant, the triumph of a church the temper of which was refined and strengthened by the blows of a tragic fate, is no less dramatic and significant. Furthermore as the importance of the Russian revolution extends far beyond the borders of the U.S.S.R., so also the importance of the religious evolution of Russia since 1918 extends beyond the limits of Orthodoxy in that country. It tells a story which Orthodox Greece and the Balkans, Protestant and Catholic Germany and Italy, England and even the United States should read, mark, learn and inwardly digest.

In the earliest period of Russian history down to the fall of

Kiev, the church's most valuable gift to the growing state was education which not only raised the cultural level of the barbaric Slavs, but also aided vastly in their social and political cohesion. From 1238–1480 Russia was under Tatar domination and during this time the church supported Russian ethnic unity in a way and to a degree impossible for any other existing institution. It acted as a quiet but sure defence of the Russian heritage and paved the way for a new political enterprise and a new sense of national destiny. In doing this the church backed the initiative of the Great Princess of Moscow who broke the Tatar yoke and replaced the amorphous federation of Slavic princedoms by a unified rule. Russia became first a country and then an empire. As a price for its support the church associated itself on a plane of high dignity with the new state. It sanctified national life, provided it with a theory of church and state which worked alternately to the advantage and disadvantage of both parties and it secured control over many areas of life, secular as well as religious and maintained a tenacious hold on them. This was a long period and had many ups and downs. It witnessed the inevitable conflict of church and state which presents so many striking similarities and contrasts to the same conflict in the west. It saw Moscow cut the bonds of dependence on Constantinople and become an independent patriarchate and Nikon's liturgical reforms produce the secession of the Old Ritualists (Believers). It encloses the reigns of Peter I and the great Catherine when the church was bound to the state with the loss of its autonomy and much of its property. It saw Russian imperialism grow and Russian liberalism trampled under foot by church and state working in close coöperation. It closes with the downfall of both institutions, leaving the church all but mortally ill of a malady only revolution could cure. In the revolutionary period of the last twenty-eight years it has narrowly escaped extinction but for the first time has been free to fulfill its spiritual mission without distraction or confusion, cut off from political entanglements and the control of secular education, it could act only through the practice of its religion and in this way it has clarified its goal and gained in its effective pursuit.

The Slavs who submitted to baptism in the reign of Vladimir

the Great were for the most part illiterate, not only the lower strata of society but the noble and royal families as well. The Moravian ambassadors to Michael II had said, "Our nation is baptized and yet we have no teacher to direct and instruct us. . . . We understand neither Greek nor Latin. Some teach us one thing and some another. Furthermore we do not understand written characters or their meaning." [1] The Russians were not much better off at the end of the tenth century. The Primary Chronicle states that "the people called Oleg 'the Sage' " but adds tartly, "for they were but pagans and therefore ignorant." [2] The treaty with the Greeks over the rights of Russians to visit Constantinople under Igor (945) refers to Russian Christians and these must have had clergy who could at least read.[3] It is, however, not clear whether they were Orthodox from Bulgaria or Byzantines or Roman Catholics from the west. It is probable that Olga who was baptized at Constantinople in 954 gave some encouragement to the local clergy,[4] though no specific instances are related and her attempts to convert her son Svyatoslav came to nothing.[5] Vladimir, however, was alive to the importance of Christian education and after his baptism, in the words of the Primary Chronicle, "took the children of the best families and sent them to schools of instruction in book learning." [6] How advanced this instruction was and what subjects it included is not known, but it is unlikely that both the inspiration and the materials of such education had other than a Byzantine origin.

The first great patron of education in Russia was Vladimir's son, Yaroslav the Wise, who by his personal cultivation and encouragement of learning, did for his country what Simeon the Wise had done for Bulgaria. The Primary Chronicle thus describes his work: "During (Yaroslav's) reign the Christian faith was fruitful and multiplied, while the number of monks increased and new monasteries came into being. Yaroslav loved religious

[1] S. H. Cross, The Russian Primary Chronicle (Harvard Studies in Philology and Literature xii) Cambridge, Mass., 1930, p. 137. Slavic text in Polnoe Sobranie russkich Letopisei I. 1, 2nd ed., Leningrad, 1926, col. 26.

[2] Cross, p. 151; P.S. col. 32.

[3] Cross, p. 160; P.S. col. 47.

[4] Cross, pp. 168–169; P.S. cols. 60–62.

[5] Cross, p. 170; P.S. col. 63.

[6] Cross, p. 205; P.S. cols. 118–119.

establishments and was devoted to priests, especially to monks. He applied himself to books and read them continually day and night. He assembled many scribes and translated from Greek into Slavic. He wrote and collected books through which true believers are instructed and enjoy religious education. For as one man plows the land, and another sows, and still others reap and eat food in abundance, so did this prince. His father Vladimir plowed and harrowed the soil when he enlightened Russia through baptism, while this prince sowed the hearts of the faithful with the written word, and we in turn reap the harvest of receiving the teaching of books. For great is the profit from book-learning. . . . Thus Yaroslav, as we have said, was a lover of books, and as he wrote many, he deposited them in the Church of St. Sophia which he himself had founded." [7]

The extent of Yaroslav's translational work has been much disputed. The text of the Primary Chronicle suggests various possibilities. Did Yaroslav himself translate, as the text says, or were his scribes also translators who carried out his orders? Were these scribes Greeks who had learned Slavonic in Russia or Bulgaria, or were they Russians who had learned Greek in Constantinople or picked it up from Greeks in their own land? Was there no influence from Bulgaria and Serbia where so much work of this kind had already been done?

The centre of Yaroslav's revival of learning was the metropolitan church of St. Sophia at Kiev, not the Monastery of the Caves. The scribes and translators employed by Yaroslav worked under royal contract and the books were deposited in a library at St. Sophia. The Pecherskii Paterikon does not suggest that learning was encouraged there at so early a date.[8]

A charming story is told in the Paterikon of Nikita the Hermit who became bishop of Novgorod but who in his youth was subject to restlessness and fits of spiritual pride.

On one occasion when saying his Office Nikita heard the voice of someone praying with him and perceived an odor of indescribable sweet-

[7] Cross, p. 226; P.S. col. 151.

[8] L. K. Goetz, Das Kiever Höhlenkloster als Kulturzentrum des vormongolischen Russlands. Passau, 1907; G. P. Fedotov, The Russian Religious Mind. Cambridge, Mass., 1946, p. 142.

ness. And he was deceived by this and said to himself 'If this were not an angel, he would not be praying with me and the fragrance of the Holy Spirit would not be here.' And he began to pray diligently, saying, 'Sir, appear to me so that I can see you.' Then a voice came to him, 'I shall not appear; you are too young. Arise, do not kneel.' The hermit said with tears, 'No, I shall not be deceived, Sir. My abbot has taught me not to heed the pretensions of the devil. Anything that you will direct me, I will do.' Then the soul-destroying devil had control of him and said, 'It is impossible for a man in the body to see me, but I shall send you my angel; he will abide with you and you will do his will.' And immediately the devil stood before him in the form of an angel. Bowing the monk saluted him as an angel and the devil said to him, 'Do not pray, but only read books and in this way you will hold converse with God and you will give useful instruction from books to those who come to you. I shall always pray for your salvation to my creator.'

The monk was deceived and stopped praying but occupied himself diligently with reading and instruction and seeing the devil constantly praying for him he rejoiced in him as an angel who had been created to pray for him. With those who came to him Nikita talked about what was profitable for the soul and began to prophesy. And he achieved a great reputation and all were amazed how his words came true. On one occasion Nikita sent to Prince Izyaslav and said to him, 'Today Gleb, Svyatoslav's son was killed at Zavolocha . . . and after a few days came the news of Gleb's death. And from that time the hermit enjoyed a reputation as a prophet and the princes and nobles listened to him attentively. Now the devil did not know the future but whatever he did himself and taught evil people, to kill or to steal, that he announced (to Nikita). When people came to the hermit to hear from him a word of consolation, the devil, the false angel, would tell what had happened through him and these he would prophesy. No one could even dispute with him from the books of the Old Testament. He knew it all by heart: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Judges, Kings and all the Prophets in order. He knew all the Hebrew books from memory but he did not wish to see or hear or read the Gospels and Epistles, those holy books given us by grace for our support and direction, and he did not permit others to discuss them with him. And from this it became apparent to all that he had been deceived by the enemy. And the fathers could not tolerate anything like this: Nikon the Abbot, Ivan who was abbot before him, Pimen the Ascetic, Isaiah who became bishop of Rostov, Matthew the Seer, Isaac the Saint, Agapetus the

Physician, Gregory the Wonderworker, Nicholas who was bishop of Tmutorakan, Nestor who wrote the Chronicle, Gregory who compiled the canons, Theoctistus who was bishop of Chernigov, Onesiphorus the Seer. All these pious men went to the object of this deception, prayed to God and expelled the devil from the hermit and after that he did not see him again. Then they conducted him out of the cave and asked him about the Old Testament wishing to hear something from him. But he swore that he had never read the books and did not know a single word of the Hebrew books which he formerly knew by heart. To put it simply, he did not know a word, so that those blessed fathers could hardly teach him to read and write.[9]

It can hardly be imagined that a learned tradition, such as often flourished in the monasteries of the Greek and Latin churches, prevailed at this time in the atmosphere of the Monastery of the Caves. On the other hand, it seems improbable either that Yaroslav made only a few translations of his own as a private hobby, dictated them to scribes and stored them in St. Sophia or that his plan for encouraging education was merely secular in spirit. The Primary Chronicle says that Yaroslav "sowed the hearts of the faithful with the written word and we in turn reap the harvest by receiving the teaching of books." His translational activity appears as part of an ambitious program of education continuing and supplementing his father's design for the education of the young nobility. Whatever success this scheme may have had and whatever may have been taught in the royal schools, the bulk of literate men in Russia in the pre-Mongolian period must have been clergy and the literature surviving from that age is mainly ecclesiastical.

It is customary to divide early Russian literature into translations from the Greek and indigenous works. The legend of the Moravian mission attributes to Constantine the translation of the Lectionary, the Liturgy and the Divine Office and to Methodius the translation of the rest of the Bible (except I and II

[9] The text is found in three main recensions, each with some variants. Cf. D. I. Abramovich, Issledovanie o Kievo-Pecherskom Paterike kak literaturnom pamyatnike. (Izvestiya Otdeleniya russkovo yazyka i slovesnosti Akademii Nauk 1901. Kn. 3–5, 1931; Kievo-Pecherskii Paterik, Kiev, 1931; V. Yakovlev, Pamyatniki russkoi literatury xii; xiii vekov. St. Petersburgh 1872. A modern Russian translation has been made by M. Viktorova, Kievopecherskii Paterik. Kiev 1870.

Maccabees) and the Nomocanon of John the Scholastic.[10] Schools of translators flourished in Bulgaria from the ninth to the eleventh centuries and in Serbia thereafter and it is probable that some translations of the Byzantine classics were imported into Russia from these centres. It is not always possible to tell where some of these early translations originated. The presence of Bulgarian features in the language is not always decisive for as Golubinskii remarks, at the beginning "Bulgarian Slavic was the literary language of Russia and therefore even Russian translators used it and must have blended their idiom with Bulgarisms. The completely correct use of Bulgarisms is evidence of a Bulgarian translator but an inaccurate use may mean that a Bulgarian translation has been contaminated by Russian scribes or that a Russian translator is operating with an inadequate knowledge of Old Bulgarian." [11]

Whether borrowed or natively produced, translations of Athanasius, the Cappadocians Basil and Gregory, Chrysostom, Ephraem Syrus, John Climacus, Gennadius and John of Damascus circulated in old Kiev along with a strangely interpolated version of Josephus' "Jewish Wars," a text of the popular novel Barlaam and Yoasaph, composed in Greek by St. Euthymius the Athonite from a Georgian original, portions of the chronicles of Malalas, Syncellus and George Hamartolus, an expanded text of Basil's Hexaemeron, originating probably in Bulgaria, Physiologus, the Topography of Cosmas Indicopleustes and a number of popular tales like the Trojan War, the apocryphal cycle of Alexander the Great and numerous biblical and Christian apocrypha, as well as lives of saints and ascetics separately and in collections like the Paterikon of Sinai. Collections of moral aphorisms like the Book of the Bee were also current and those who preferred extracts to whole treatises could sample the church fathers in collections like the Izbornik of 1076 attributed to Svyatoslav and the Selections from Chrysostom called the Zlatostrui.[12]

[10] J. B. L. 55(3), 1936, p. 196.

[11] E. Golubinskii, Istoriya russkoi tserkvi I. 1, Moscow, 1904, p. 731.

[12] N. K. Hudzii, Istoriya drevnei russkoi literatury, Moscow, 1941, pp. 30 ff; Fedotov, p. 45; A. S. Archangelskii, K izucheniyu, drevne-russkoi literatury. St. Petersburgh, 1888.

More interesting than these translational pieces which represent the assimilation of Byzantine themes and taste are the native literary products of the Kievan period. One of the earliest and most important of these is the Sermon on Law and Grace attributed to Hilarion.[13] In Nestor's account of the founding of the Pecherskii Monastery, Hilarion is described as a priest from Berestovo who embraced the solitary life and lived in a cave on the Dnieper, the site later chosen for the monastery. He was appointed metropolitan of Kiev by Yaroslav, an unprecedented act, as metropolitans were regularly sent from Constantinople by the patriarch. The explanation is probably to be found in the war with Byzantium 1043 and the resulting tension between the Russian and Greek churches which is reflected in the sermon's emphasis on the independence of Russian Christianity.

Hudzii writes, The subject matter of the "Sermon" was suggested to Hilarian chiefly by the contemporary scene, the political situation created by Yaroslav's day for the young Kievan state and its cultural agent, the church. The central theme of the "Sermon" contained in the eulogy of Vladimir appears to be the analogy between the Russian prince as disseminator of the Christian faith in his dominions, the Russian soil itself, which is "famous and known throughout the whole world," and the Russian Church. The composition of the sermon was doubtless evoked by the attempt to defend the independence of the Russian church from Byzantium and to show from the whole course of Russian history its right to an autonomous existence. Hilarian could not have been ignorant of that basic tendency, encouraged among us by Byzantine church agents, that Russia was bound to Byzantium by its acceptance of Christianity. This tendency is very clearly expressed even in the accounts in the chronicles of Russia's acceptance of the Christian faith. As if tacitly protesting against this, Hilarian maintains that Vladimir adopted Christianity as his own and by a direct revelation from on high. He had only heard "of the Orthodox land of Greece attached to Christ and strong in faith" and hearing this yearned in his heart and was inflamed in his spirit, desiring to become a Christian and to baptize his own domain but it is not otherwise evident from the Sermon that Byzantium took any part in Vladimir's conversion to Christianity. On the contrary Hilarian points out that Vladimir could have had no example or been exposed to any influences from without which could have

[13] A. I. Pomarev, Pamyatniki drevne-russkoi tserkovno-uchitelnoi literatury I, St. Petersburgh, 1894, pp. 48 ff.

led him to the idea of the superiority of Christianity over paganism; . . . nevertheless he believed and became a pious Christian, a lover of the poor, a protector of the weak and needy, a defender of the persecuted and enslaved. He built churches and adorned them, was a patron of the clergy and consulted like Constantine the Great with the bishops on what laws should be promulgated in the newly converted kingdom.[14]

Not only the content but the style of the work is an indication of the high level of culture achieved and spread by the church in the Kievan period. Golubinskii points out the remarkable mastery of the rhetorical art which it displays and makes it comparable to the speeches of the modern Karamzin.[15] It is worth recalling that rhetoric occupied an important position in contemporary Byzantine education. Ignatius's life of Nicephorus speaks of the devices of rhetoric, the mastery of which is requisite for correct composition and the study of Greek metre and of the works of the rhetoricians which improves style.[16] It will be remembered that liberal education in Byzantium in the ninth century was encouraged by the court and opposed by the monastic clergy. It seems probable that Vladimir and Yaroslav borrowed their educational programs from the Greek capital. The Pecherskii monks were not as a yet a power like the monks of Studion to oppose such a trend. There is, however, nothing in the Paterikon to suggest that they encouraged it.

However much credit is due to rulers like Vladimir and Yaroslav for the rise and spread of education in Old Kiev, the major responsibility for the cultural achievement must rest with the Graeco-Slavic clergy, the one continuously literate class whose activity in Russia before Vladimir is attested by the Primary Chronicle and to whose efforts the conversion and cultivation of early Russia should be attributed. They served as links not only with Byzantium but with the learned centres in Bulgaria and Serbia. Theirs was the knowledge of Byzantine culture from which so much of early Russian literature is derived and

[14] Hudzii, op. cit., p. 86, cf. S. Lichachev Natsionalnoe samosoznanie drevnei Rusi. Moscow, 1945, p. 32; Fedotov, p. 84.

[15] Op. cit. I. 1, p. 844.

[16] Ignatius Diaconus, Vita Nicephori (ed. de Boor), p. 149; F. Dvornik, Les légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance (Byzantino-slavica Supplementum I) Prague, 1933, p. 28.

theirs the will to form a perfect and literary language from the Slavic dialects of Russia and the Balkans. It was their instruction that formed the mind and character of that most Christian prince Vladimir Monomach whose admonitions to the sons who were to succeed him embody with notable perfection the ideal of the Christian prince.

"As you read these words, my son," he writes, "praise God who has shown us his mercy and admonished you through the medium of my poor wit. . . . If it is in any way possible, fail not one single night to kneel to the ground three times, in case that you cannot do so more often. . . . Whenever you kiss the Cross to confirm an oath made to your brethren or to any other man, first test your heart as to whether you can abide by your word. . . . Receive with affection the blessings of bishops, priests and priors and shun them not but rather according to your means, love and help them, that you may receive from them their intercession in the presence of God. . . . Be not lax in the discipline of your homes. . . . When you set out to war, be not inactive, depend not upon your captains. Set the sentries yourself and take your rest only after you have posted them at night at every important point about your troops. . . . When journeying by road through your domain do not permit your followers or another's company to visit violence upon the villages or upon the dwellings, lest men revile you. . . . Visit the sick and accompany the dead, for we are all but mortal. Pass no man without a greeting; give him a kindly word. Love your wives but grant them no power over you. . . . Forget not what useful knowledge you possess and acquire that with which you are not acquainted, even as my father (Vsevolod), though he remained at home in his own country, still understood five languages. For by this means honor is acquired in other lands. . . . Go to church; let not the rising sun find you in your bed. For this was my father's habit and it is likewise the custom of all good and perfect men." [17]

This is the language of the clerically trained. The teachers, however, paid their price. Hilarian's picture of Vladimir is more than an eulogy. It is drawn on the background of a theory of church and state which came into its own in imperial times. It is prophetic of that sinister union of ecclesiastical and civil absolutism achieved by Peter the Great and continued by his successors down to 1917.

[17] Cross, p. 304.

Vladimir Monomach was the last great monarch of Old Kiev. Neither his sons nor his brothers were imbued with his spirit and the kingdom went down in a bath of fraticidal blood. The period of separated and divided principalities set in and offered an exposed flank to the Mongolian invaders whose first spearhead was thrust at Ryazan in December, 1237 by Batu, the grandson of Ghenghis Khan. The Mongols utilized the divisions among the Russian princes skillfully for their own end and overran the country from the Caucasus to Poland, from the Urals to the Danube. Ryazan, Kolomna, Moscow, Vladimir, and Kiev fell in rapid succession. The old capital was razed in 1240 and never recovered her ancient glory.

The Mongols were a nomadic people and never really settled in Russia until after their power declined. They invaded, conquered and occupied but never assimilated nor contributed the essential elements of culture. The local princes were left largely to their own devices and permitted to rule their domains as they wished, provided they offered no resistance to Tatar hegemony, paid their taxes, did military service, visited the khan annually observing the rigid etiquette imposed upon them at the Tatar court. Even greater freedom was permitted the clergy both in the practice of religion and in the administration of ecclesiastical property and affairs. The Tatars were traditionally tolerant of other religions. Golubinskii quotes the reply of the great khan to a Franciscan sent by Ludwig the Pious to convert him, "We Mongols believe that there is one God (for all peoples), by whom we live and die and toward whom we maintain a right disposition. But as God gave several fingers to the hand, so he opened to men various ways (of salvation). God gave to you Scriptures and you Christians did not preserve them but he gave us diviners (shamans) and we do everything they tell us and live in peace." [18] The text of this reply hardly inspires confidence but its general tenor no doubt corresponds with the Tatar attitude toward the religion of their subjects. It should also be remembered that Christianity was no new thing to the invaders who were undoubtedly familiar with the Nestorians of China and had met with Christians of various kinds in their sweep across Central

[18] II. 1, p. 30.

Asia and Persia. It is possible, as Golubinskii suggests, that the feelings of the khans toward Christianity changed after their conversion to Mohammedanism in the thirteenth century, but their policy remained unaltered. Apart from their habitual tolerance of other religions the protection and encouragement given to the church by the khans was undoubtedly part of their strategy to divide and rule. It was to them a godsend that the Russian principalities had been unable to present to them an undivided front. It was an additional advantage to be able to complicate Russian politics by supporting the pan-Russian church against the pretensions of the local princes and boyars. Ecclesiastical like civil authorities operated under written authorizations from the khan called *yarlyki*; some of these have survived and are our chief source of information for the relations between the church and the Mongol state. Each metropolitan on his way from Constantinople to Kiev presented his credentials to the khan and received his permission to exercise his functions. If a khan died the metropolitan made a state call upon his successor to insure his favor. It has been suggested that Uzbek (1313–1341), the most powerful of the khans after Batu, insisted on this formality as a kind of investiture [19] but the favors shown by the khans to the church were more important than any notions the former may have held about them. The hierarchy was exempt from taxes and tribute, their lands were inviolable and their serfs untouchable. The object of the *yarlyki* appears to have been to impress this fact upon the local Mongol bureaucrats and their agents who were subject to the death penalty for infringing upon the rights of the church and its clergy.

It is obvious that conditions under the Tatar yoke were not favorable to the maintenance much less the advancement of Russian culture. Apart from the local chronicles little significant literature has come down from this period. In spite of their resentment and covert hostility to the Mongol regime the Russian princes were not uninfluenced by the customs of their overlords. As late as Peter's reign the manners and even the dress of the Mongols were affected by the Russian upper classes. There can be little doubt that the Graeco-Slavic heritage would have been

[19] II. 1, p. 31.

much more seriously impaired if it had not been preserved intact by the church which wisely utilized its favored position to this end. When the Great Princes of Moscow grew strong and threw off the Tatar yoke, the church was not only their most powerful ally but could restore to their hands the unbroken tradition of Graeco-Slavic culture. The chronicles of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as well as such pieces as the life of St. Alexander Nevskii [20] were products of this segregated tradition which combined its strength with the military prowess of Ivan III, Basil and Ivan IV. These not only expelled the invader but relegated his influence to that of a mere episode in the spiritual evolution of the Russian people.

The Mongol empire fell apart for reasons similar to those which led to the destruction of old Kiev; it grew fat and well liking, developed internal dissensions and gave an opening to enemies shrewd enough and powerful enough to see their chance and deal it a mortal blow. Russia emerged a new state with a new capital, Moscow. The Great Princes of Moscow took advantage of the divided councils of the local principalities, as the Mongols had done before them and subjected all to their own central rule. The vastness of their united territory, the ethnic unity and common cultural heritage of the bulk of their population made of their state an empire increasing in vigor and creative vitality while the power of Byzantium first declined and then succumbed to the Turks. Moscow became not only the capital of the new state but the see of the metropolitan and in 1589 the residence of the first Russian patriarch. The maneuver which secured to the church an autonomous head satisfied both secular and ecclesiastical ambitions. In the eyes of Russian churchmen as well as statesmen Moscow had become the third Rome.[21]

From 1589 to the accession of Peter the Great the church was a powerful imperium in imperio and adroitly took advantage of the rivalry between the tsars and the boyars to maintain and strengthen its position. During this formative period it was the church of the nation without becoming a national church.

[20] V. Mansikaa, Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskavo (Pamyatniki drevnei pismenosti i iskusstva ccxxx) Moscow, 1913; Hudzii, op. cit., p. 198.

[21] H. Schaeder, Moskau des dritte Rom. Hamburg, 1929; N. S. Chaev, Moskva-Tretii Rim, Istoricheskie Zapiski, A. N. S. S. S. R., vol. 17, Moscow, 1945.

The political genius of Peter the Great showed itself nowhere more conspicuously than in effecting this transformation and creating a national church by replacing the patriarchate by the Holy Synod and subjecting the latter to his own autocratic will by the decree known as the Ecclesiastical Instructions and by the invention of the office of High Procurator to safeguard the interests of the tsar in all ecclesiastical affairs.

During the imperial era, as we have indicated, the principal contribution of the church to Russian culture was its sanctification of national life and its guardianship of the practice of religion. Both were accomplished with difficulty and imperilled by the corrosive influences of secularism and political opportunism. The upper strata of Russian society were permeated by the ideas of the Aufklärung from the reign of Peter the Great to the accession of Alexander I. The unstable piety of the latter was not altogether an asset to the church and in the '40's a new intellectual ferment began which led in one direction to the neo-Byzantinism of the Slavophiles but more significantly in the other to various forms of empiricism and ultimately to dialectical materialism. Russia experienced no Renaissance and no Protestant Reformation, both of which in the west had infused new life into a declining faith. Russia met the impact of nationalism unfortified by these experiences and the cleavage between educated and uneducated Christians there was dangerously wide. The political influence of the church was controlled by the state the strongest bulwark of which was the hierarchy. This unholy and unhappy alliance led to the ruin of both but for this the state rather than the church must be blamed. Against formidable odds the church maintained the ideal of Holy Russia. The Russia of the tsars splintered under the hot breath of revolution. Socially and politically Holy Russia remained, as it had always been, an ideal rather than an actuality but combined with an unbroken tradition of Christian piety and observance it enabled the church to survive and revive long after the followers of Lenin had brought a new secular order into being.

In estimating the effect of the revolution on Russian Orthodoxy it is important to remember that in spite of their close association the church and the state were not identical. For the tsarist

state 1917–18 was the end; for the church — although it did not seem so at the time — it was a new beginning. The last imperial champions of Orthodoxy were the misguided Nicholas II and his unhappy tsarina. But behind them stood Pobedonostsev, Nicholas' tutor and high procurator, and the revolting figure of Rasputin, a willing tool of the reactionaries. The attachment ex animo of the royal couple and of Pobedonostsev to Orthodoxy is unquestionable, as well as their conviction that the imperial state alone could provide the security needed by the church. Their guiding passion was, however, autocracy imbedded in orthodoxy and justified by it. Pobedonostsev wrote in his essay Church and State in the Moskovskii Sbornik

> The most ancient and best known system of relationship between church and state is that of the established or state church. The church recognizes one faith out of the total number as the true faith and supports and defends one church exclusively in preference to all other churches and faiths. This preference means that all other churches are not recognized as true or completely true. . . . The state cannot be the representative of merely material interests. In such a case it would be deprived of spiritual power and excluded from spiritual unity with the people. The greater the state's significance the more clearly must it represent spiritual interests. Only under these conditions are the sense of law, the respect for law and confidence in the authority of government sustained and fortified. Neither the principle of political absolutism, of political paternalism nor even of political utilitarianism is adequate by itself for the maintenance of a close relation between the people and the government. Even the moral principle is unstable, weak and cut from the basic root when it is deprived of religious sanctions. Any state which cuts itself from any particular faith in the name of an impartial attitude to all is without doubt deprived of that central cohesive force. The confidence of the mass of people in the government is based on faith, i.e., not only on the unity of faith between the people and the state but also on the simple conviction that the state has a faith and acts by that faith.

How thoroughly imbued with the same principles the tsar and tsarina were is evident from the former's observations on granting the constitution in a letter to his mother (1905) and from innumerable remarks of the empress in her correspondence with her husband.

The constitutional measures taken against the church after 1918 involved the separation of the church from the state and education from the church, the confiscation of church as of all other private property, and after 1929 the prohibition of all propaganda in favor of religion, in fact of all religious instruction outside the sermon at Divine Liturgy. The attack on the church was, however, implemented by all sorts of party maneuvers which followed a strategic plan to exterminate religion from public and private life.[22] Its failure before the war was lamented by Yaroslavskii,[23] the head of the anti-religious crusade and it was abandoned as a consequence of the revival of religion preparatory to and during the war. The need to defend the fatherland aroused feelings of patriotism of a kind long dormant and the authorities had to reckon with the fact that vast numbers were prepared to fight as enthusiastically for Holy as for Red Russia. The churches were thronged with the faithful asking God's blessing on the Red Army. The church played its hand extremely well. To have remained Orthodox in the years of trial was itself a test of conviction and character especially on the part of the clergy. Under the wise guidance of the Patriarch Sergius and with the coöperation of Alexei, then archbishop of Leningrad, now patriarch, the church modestly met the needs of its flock and consistently encouraged loyalty and support to the government at war. Religion had been made an expensive indulgence by the Bolsheviks. The church nevertheless contributed a sum of 6,000,000 rubles to the defense fund and this money was raised from voluntary contributions. Alexei in his pastoral as metropolitan of Leningrad at the outbreak of the war, tells of a find of pre-war gold ruble notes left anonymously before the ikon of S. Nicholas for the national defense fund.[24]

More difficult for the foreigner to understand is the assimilation by the church of the new secular order and its achievements. This was, however, not only essential to the church's survival but wholly consistent with its principles. The generation of the '20's and '30's in Russia witnessed both unprecedented social destruc-

[22] R. P. Casey, Religion in Russia, New York 1946, p. 87.
[23] Op. cit., p. 96.
[24] Op. cit., p. 135.

tion and unparalleled social reconstruction. As life went on, its quality improved — to everyone's surprise except the Russians — and phenomenal accomplishments engendered a utopian mood. Outsiders have been taught to view the whole course of the revolutionary development with a jaundiced eye but their teachers have been leaders of the emigration, men who for one reason or another could not or would not bear the heat of the revolutionary day. To those who shared in the struggle the good was as evident as the bad and in the '30's before the war the rushing stream of progress overran the counter stream of cultural regression. This was as evident to Christians as to the godless followers of Yaroslavskii and the Soviet world was the only one known to youth. This fact is enshrined in a poem written in 1935 by a young Armenian, Ovannes Shiraz: —

> The old world is unknown to me,
> I knew it not in youth.
> What would recall it to me
> Out of the obscurity of dusk and murk?
> But when I look
> Into my gray-haired mother's eyes
> It rises menacing with death and filth and misery replete.
> The old world is unknown to me,
> I knew it not in youth,
> But in the dimming pupils of her eyes
> Its mists do hover still.[25]

It was only by reckoning with this mood and making the new secular culture its own that the church avoided becoming a hopeless anachronism. Suspicions that the recognition of the state and an acceptance of its favors in the last decade represent an abandonment of principle and are only time-serving gestures made by an accommodating and ambitious hierarchy miss the whole point of the dialectic between secular and Christian culture in Russia at the present day. Reconciliation with the state has brought recognition of the church. Its doors are opened, its voice can again be heard and the meaning of its sacramental life once more proclaimed. The Russian clergy and laity have worked

[25] Op. cit., p. 164.

hard and endured much to achieve this end. The only thing in their favor was that man is natively and unquenchably religious and that the godless theory of their opponents was unrealistic and chimerical. In 1942 the patriarchal church was permitted to issue its apologia in a series of essays under the title "The Truth about Religion in Russia." In its preface the Patriarch Sergius writes:

> In a word, inconceivable chaos prevailed in our church, reminiscent of the condition of the Universal Church at the time of the Arian controversy, as described by Basil the Great. In the face of what appeared to be the imminent dissolution of the whole Russian Church, our Patriarchate could not count on protection or aid from the outside, nor in principle did it expect such aid. Our sister churches could only offer their sympathy, besides which having no perspective on our ecclesiastical affairs, they sometimes did not rightly know in what particular direction they should extend their sympathy. In our external position of helplessness, we could count only on the moral power of established truth, which had more than once in the past saved the church from final disintegration. And we were not disappointed in our expectation. We have the courage to say this in spite of the defects of our administration. Our Russian Church has not been distracted and tormented by every blast of circumstance. It has maintained uncompromisingly the consciousness of its tradition as well as its traditionally recognized authority, viz., its blessed succession from the Universal Church and its recognized place in the company of Orthodox autocephalous churches.[26]

This statement contains the essence of the Russian church's position today. It explains its leaders' tone of confidence, of awareness of responsibility and of work to be done. The old ecclesiastical chauvinism and Erastianism have yielded to the demand and opportunity for a church concerned solely with its own business of the cure of souls. This break with the secular past is widely misunderstood outside of Russia and hotly resented by some sections of the church of the emigration, especially in this country. In Russia itself, however, it represents a conscious emancipation from a disastrous alliance which had crippled its effectiveness, sapped its life blood and drawn it into a vortex of social chaos from which it narrowly escaped with its life.

[26] Review of Religion, May 1944, p. 371.

INDEX OF THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Vol. XXX (1937) — Vol. XL (1947)

INDEX OF AUTHORS

Armstrong, Maurice W., Jonathan Scott's "Brief View."	Vol. XL	p. 121
Religious Enthusiasm and Separatism in Colonial New England.	Vol. XXXVIII	p. 111
Bainton, Roland H., The Early Church and War.	Vol. XXXIX	p. 189
Bark, William, Boethius' Fourth Tractate, The So-Called *De Fide Catholica*.	Vol. XXXIX	p. 55
Bark, William C., John Maxentius and the Collectio Palatina.	Vol. XXXVI	p. 93
Bell, H. I., Evidences of Christianity in Egypt during the Roman Period.	Vol. XXXVII	p. 185
Bikerman, Elie, Latens Deus.	Vol. XXXIX	p. 169
Bixler, Julius Seelye, The Contribution of *Existenz-Philosophie*.	Vol. XXXIII	p. 35
Two Questions Raised by William James's Essay on 'The Moral Equivalent of War.'	Vol. XXXV	p. 117
Bloch, Herbert, A New Document of the Last Pagan Revival in the West.	Vol. XXXVIII	p. 199
Bloomfield, Morton W., The Origin of the Concept of the Seven Cardinal Sins.	Vol. XXXIV	p. 121
Bluhm, H. S., The Significance of Luther's Earliest Extant Sermon.	Vol. XXXVII	p. 175
Bober, Phyllis Pray, The Mithraic Symbolism of Mercury Carrying the Infant Bacchus.	Vol. XXXIX	p. 75
Bonner, Campbell, Additions and Corrections.	Vol. XXXVII	p. 333
Aeolus Figured on Colic Amulets.	Vol. XXXV	p. 87
A Coptic Fragment of Melito's Homily on the Passion.	Vol. XXXII	p. 141
Desired Haven.	Vol. XXXIV	p. 49
Magical Amulets.	Vol. XXXIX	p. 25
Note on Mark 6. 20.	Vol. XXXVII	p. 41
Rhetologia or Aretalogia?	Vol. XXXIII	p. 317
A Supplementary Note on the Opening of Melito's Homily.	Vol. XXXVI	p. 317
A Tarsian Peculiarity (Dio Prus. Or. 33).	Vol. XXXV	p. 1
The Technique of Exorcism.	Vol. XXXVI	p. 39
Two Problems in Melito's Homily on the Passion.	Vol. XXXI	p. 175
Boynton, Mary Fuertes, Simon Alcok on Expanding the Sermon.	Vol. XXXIV	p. 201
Brown, Truesdell S., Euhemerus and the Historians.	Vol. XXXIX	p. 259
Butler, Christopher, St. Luke's Debt to St. Matthew.	Vol. XXXII	p. 237

Cadbury, Henry J., Christopher Meidel and the First Norwegian Contacts with Quakerism.	Vol. XXXIV	p. 7
Early Quakerism and Uncanonical Lore.	Vol. XL	p. 177
Cameron, A., An Epigram of the Fifth Century B.C.	Vol. XXXIII	p. 97
Inscriptions Relating to Sacral Manumission and Confession.	Vol. XXXII	p. 143
Sappho's Prayer to Aphrodite.	Vol. XXXII	p. 1
Cannon, M. H., The Mormon Declaration of Rights.	Vol. XXXV	p. 181
Casey, Robert P., Constantine Harmenopoulos's Work on Heresy.	Vol. XL	p. 207
The Cultural Mission of Russian Orthodoxy.	Vol. XL	p. 257
Cawley, Frank Stanton, The Figure of Loki in Germanic Mythology.	Vol. XXXII	p. 309
Clark, Walter Eugene, Religion and Science.	Vol. XXXI	p. 93
Daube, David, κερδαίνω As a Missionary Term.	Vol. XL	p. 109
Dodds, E. R., Maenadism in the Bacchae.	Vol. XXXIII	p. 155
Dorwart, Reinhold A., Church Organization in Brandenburg-Prussia from the Reformation to 1740.	Vol. XXXI	p. 275
Dubs, Homer H., An Ancient Chinese Mystery Cult.	Vol. XXXV	p. 221
Ehrhardt, Arnold, Vir Bonus Quadrato Lapidi Comparatur.	Vol. XXXVIII	p. 177
Enslin, Morton S., The Atoning Work of Christ in the New Testament.	Vol. XXXVIII	p. 39
Irenaeus: Mostly Prolegomena.	Vol. XL	p. 137
Luke and the Samaritans.	Vol. XXXVI	p. 277
Ferguson, William Scott, The Attic Orgeones.	Vol. XXXVII	p. 61
Festugière, A. J., Hermetica.	Vol. XXXI	p. 1
Finkelstein, Louis. The Oldest Midrash: Pre-Rabbinic Ideals and Teachings in the Passover Haggadah.	Vol. XXXI	p. 291
Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah.	Vol. XXXV	p. 291
Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah.	Vol. XXXVI	p. 1
Foote, Henry Wilder, The Bay Psalm Book and Harvard Hymnody.	Vol. XXXIII	p. 225
Fowler, Murray, Some Objections to Old Norse ÞJAZI = Sanskrit Tvaṣṭṛ.	Vol. XXXV	p. 83
Frisbee, Graham, Tennant's Struggle with a "Desperate Task."	Vol. XXXV	p. 199
Furlani, Giuseppe, The Basic Aspect of Hittite Religion.	Vol. XXXI	p. 251
Gilmore, Allen A. Augustine and the Critical Method.	Vol. XXXIX	p. 141
Goodenough, Erwin R., Philo on Immortality.	Vol. XXXIX	p. 85
Goodspeed, Edgar J., Thomas Jefferson and the Bible.	Vol. XL	p. 71
Gordis, Robert, The Composition and Structure of Amos.	Vol. XXXIII	p. 239
Grant, Robert M., The Decalogue in Early Christianity.	Vol. XL	p. 1
The Fourth Gospel and the Church.	Vol. XXXV	p. 95
Like Children.	Vol. XXXIX	p. 71
The Occasion of Luke III: 1–2.	Vol. XXXIII	p. 151
Theophilus of Antioch to Autolycus.	Vol. XL	p. 227
Harrer, G. A., Saul Who Also Is Called Paul.	Vol. XXXIII	p. 19

HATCH, WILLIAM H. P., An Early Edition of the New Testament in Greek. Vol. XXXIV p. 69
A Note on Matthew 6:33. Vol. XXXVIII p. 270
HEICHELHEIM, F. M., TSCHERIKOWER, V., Jewish Religious Influence in Adler Papyri. Vol. XXXV p. 25
HEICHELHEIM, F. M., On Athenaeus XIV, 639e-640a. Vol. XXXVII p. 351
Zeus Peloris. Vol. XL p. 69

JACOBS, VIVIAN and ISAAC ROSENSOHN, The Myth of Môt and 'Al'eyan Ba'al. Vol. XXXVIII p. 77
JACOBSON, N. P., Niebuhr's Philosophy of History. Vol. XXXVII p. 237
JEFFERY, ARTHUR, Ghevond's Text of the Correspondence between 'Umar II and Leo III. Vol. XXXVII p. 269
JOHNSON, SHERMAN E., The Biblical Quotations in Matthew. Vol. XXXVI p. 135
JONES, RUFUS M., Jewish Mysticism. Vol. XXXVI p. 155

KANTOROWICZ, ERNST H., A Norman Finale of the Exultet and the Rite of Sarum. Vol. XXXIV p. 129
KLUCKHOHN, CLYDE, Myths and Rituals: A General Theory. Vol. XXXV p. 45
Some Personal and Social Aspects of Navaho Ceremonial Practice. Vol. XXXII p. 57
KNOX, WILFRED LAWRENCE, The Ending of St. Mark's Gospel. Vol. XXXV p. 13
Jewish Liturgical Exorcism. Vol. XXXI p. 191
KRAELING, CARL H., The Episode of the Roman Standards at Jerusalem. Vol. XXXV p. 263
KUHN, HAROLD B., The Problem of Human Self-Transcendence in the Dialectical Theology. Vol. XL p. 47

LAIRD, JOHN, The Philosophy of Incarnation. Vol. XXXIII p. 131
Theism and Hypertheism. Vol. XXXVI p. 63
LAISTNER, M. L. W., Antiochene Exegesis in Western Europe during the Middle Ages. Vol. XL p. 19
Was Bede the Author of a Penitential? Vol. XXXI p. 263
The Western Church and Astrology during the Early Middle Ages. Vol. XXXIV p. 251
LATTE, KURT, The Coming of the Pythia. Vol. XXXIII p. 9
LEWY, HANS, Aristotle and the Jewish Sage According to Clearchus of Soli. Vol. XXXI p. 205
A Latin Hymn to the Creator Ascribed to Plato. Vol. XXXIX p. 243

MCCOLLEY, GRANT, The Book of Enoch and Paradise Lost. Vol. XXXI p. 21
Paradise Lost. Vol. XXXII p. 181
MCCOWN, C. C., Codex and Roll in the New Testament. Vol. XXXIV p. 219
In History or Beyond History. Vol. XXXVIII p. 151
MAGOUN, FRANCIS PEABODY, JR., Aldhelm's Diocese of Sherborne *Bewestan Wuda*. Vol. XXXII p. 103
The Rome of Two Northern Pilgrims: Archbishop Sigeric of Canterbury and Abbot Nikolás of Munkathverá. Vol. XXXIII p. 267
On Some Survivals of Pagan Belief in Anglo-Saxon England. Vol. XL p. 33
MATTINGLY, HAROLD, The Later Paganism. Vol. XXXV p. 171
The Religious Background of the 'Historia Avgvsta.' Vol. XXXIX p. 213
MILLER, PERRY. Solomon Stoddard, 1643–1729. Vol. XXXIV p. 277

Montgomery, James A., Hebrew *Hesed* and Greek *Charis*.	Vol. XXXII	p. 97
Soul Gods.	Vol. XXXIV	p. 321
The Highest, Heaven, Aeon, Time, etc., in Semitic Religion.	Vol. XXXI	p. 143
Myers, Robert Manson, Fifty Sermons on Handel's Messiah.	Vol. XXXIX	p. 217
Nilsson, Martin P., Greek Mysteries in the Confession of St. Cyprian.	Vol. XL	p. 167
A Note on the Epitaph of Terentius.	Vol. XXXV	p. 81
The Origin of Belief among the Greeks in the Divinity of the Heavenly Bodies.	Vol. XXXIII	p. 1
Pagan Divine Service in Late Antiquity.	Vol. XXXVIII	p. 63
Problems of the History of Greek Religion in the Hellenistic and Roman Age.	Vol. XXXVI	p. 251
Nock, Arthur Darby, The Cult of Heroes.	Vol. XXXVII	p. 141
A Feature of Roman Religion.	Vol. XXXII	p. 83
Orphism or Popular Philosophy?	Vol. XXXIII	p. 301
Postscript.	Vol. XXXIV	p. 103
Ogle, Marbury B., Bible Text or Liturgy?	Vol. XXXIII	p. 191
"The Way of All Flesh."	Vol. XXXI	p. 41
Oliver, James H., A Gnostic Amulet.	Vol. XXXIII	p. 321
Oliver, Peter, "Probationers for Eternity." Notes on Religion in the United States in the Year 1800.	Vol. XXXVII	p. 219
Parzen, Herbert, The Prophets and the Omri Dynasty.	Vol. XXXIII	p. 69
Pease, Arthur Stanley, Caeli Enarrant.	Vol. XXXIV	p. 163
Post, L. A., A Note on Sophronius of Damascus.	Vol. XXXVI	p. 91
Quasten, Johannes, Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Exorcism of the Cilicium.	Vol. XXXV	p. 209
"Vetus Superstitio et Nova Religio" the Problem of *Refrigerium* in the Ancient Church of North Africa.	Vol. XXXIII	p. 253
Rabinowitz, Jacob J., Some Remarks on the Evasion of the Usury Laws in the Middle Ages.	Vol. XXXVII	p. 49
Richardson, Cyril C., The Quartodecimans and the Synoptic Chronology.	Vol. XXXIII	p. 177
The So-Called Epiclesis in Hippolytus.	Vol. XL	p. 101
Richardson, R. D., The Doctrine of the Trinity: Its Development, Difficulties and Value.	Vol. XXXVI	p. 109
Rigg, Horace A., Jr., Thallus: The Samaritan?	Vol. XXXIV	p. 111
Robbins, William J., Some Aspects of Pueblo Indian Religion.	Vol. XXXIV	p. 25
Rose, Herbert Jennings, Aretalogia or Teratologia?	Vol. XXXIV	p. 217
A Colloquialism in Plato, *Rep.*, 621b 8.	Vol. XXXI	p. 91
Greek Rites of Stealing.	Vol. XXXIV	p. 1
The Grief of Persephone.	Vol. XXXVI	p. 247
Hephaistion of Thebes and Christianity.	Vol. XXXIII	p. 65
Herakles and the Gospels.	Vol. XXXI	p. 113
Qvisque Svos Patimvr Manes.	Vol. XXXVII	p. 45
Theology and Mythology in Aeschylus.	Vol. XXXIX	p. 1
The Nature of Prophecy in the Light of Recent Study.	Vol. XXXVIII	p. 1
Rowley, H. H., The Marriage of Ruth.	Vol. XL	p. 77

SANDERS, HENRY A., A Fragment of the Acta Pauli in the Michigan Collection. Vol. XXXI p. 73
Three Theological Fragments. Vol. XXXVI p. 165
SILK, EDMUND T., Boethius's Consolatio Philosophiae as a Sequel to Augustine's Dialogues and Soliloquia. Vol. XXXII p. 19
SILVERSTEIN, THEODORE, The Passage of the Souls to Purgatory in the *Divina Commedia*. Vol. XXXI p. 53
The Throne of the Emperor Henry in Dante's Paradise and the Mediaeval Conception of Christian Kingship. Vol. XXXII p. 115
SMOTHERS, EDGAR R., The Coverdale Translation of Psalm LXXXIV. Vol. XXXVIII p. 245
SOLMSEN, FRIEDRICH, Strata of Greek Religion in Aeschylus. Vol. XL
SPRAGUE, THEODORE W., The "World" Concept among Jehovah's Witnesses. Vol. XXXIX p. 109
SPERRY, WILLARD L., Two Letters. Vol. XXXIV p. 145
SWAIN, JOSEPH WARD, Gamaliel's Speech and Caligula's Statue. Vol. XXXVII p. 341

TELFER, W., The Codex Verona LX(58). Vol. XXXVI p. 169
TORREY, CHARLES C., Armageddon. Vol. XXXI p. 237
The Name "Iscariot." Vol. XXXVI p. 51
The Older Book of Esther. Vol. XXXVII p. 1
TRAVIS, ALBERT H., Marius Victorinus: A Biographical Note. Vol. XXXVI p. 83
TSCHERIKOWER, V., HEICHELHEIM, F. M. Jewish Religious Influence in Adler Papyri. Vol. XXXV p. 25
TRUEBLOOD, D. ELTON, The Influence of Emerson's Divinity School Address. Vol. XXXII p. 41

UTLEY, FRANCIS LEE. The Layman's Complaint and the Friar's Answer. Vol. XXXVIII p. 141

WALTON, FRANCIS REDDING, The Date of the Adonia at Athens. Vol. XXXI p. 65
WELLES, C. B., The Epitaph of Julius Terentius. Vol. XXXIV p. 79
WHITING, B. J., Pepys, Fuller and an Archbishop. Vol. XXXVIII p. 71
WILLIAMS, ARNOLD, Milton and the Book of Enoch — An Alternative Hypothesis. Vol. XXXIII p. 291
WINTER, J. G., Another Instance of *ὀρθοποσδεῖν*. Vol. XXXIV p. 161
WOLFF, ROBERT LEE, Barlaam and Ioasaph. Vol. XXXII p. 131
WOLFSON, HARRY AUSTRYN. The Amphibolous Terms in Aristotle, Arabic Philosophy and Maimonides. Vol. XXXI p. 151
Philo on Free Will. Vol. XXXV p. 131
WRIGHT, CONRAD, Edwards and the Arminians on the Freedom of the Will. Vol. XXXV p. 241

YOUTIE, HERBERT C., A Codex of Jonah: Berl. Sept. 18 + P. S. I. X, 1164. Vol. XXXVIII p. 195
ΙΣΙΣ ΤΡΙΧΩΜΑΤΟΣ. Vol. XXXIX p. 165
Sambathis. Vol. XXXVII p. 209

ZUNTZ, G., On the Opening Sentence of Melito's Paschal Homily. Vol. XXXVI p. 299